

Andrews University

## Digital Commons @ Andrews University

---

Dissertations

Graduate Research

---

1996

### The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch : Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of Their Applicability

H. Ross Cole

*Andrews University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), and the [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Cole, H. Ross, "The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch : Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of Their Applicability" (1996). *Dissertations*. 25.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/25>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library  
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by  
not duplicating or distributing additional copies  
in any form without the author's express written  
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# **UMI**

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600





Andrews University  
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE SACRED TIMES PRESCRIBED IN THE PENTATEUCH:  
OLD TESTAMENT INDICATORS OF THE EXTENT  
OF THEIR APPLICABILITY

A Dissertation  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by  
H. Ross Cole  
May 1996

**UMI Number: 9630648**

**Copyright 1996 by  
Cole, H. Ross**

**All rights reserved.**

---

**UMI Microform 9630648  
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

© Copyright by H. Ross Cole 1996  
All Rights Reserved

THE SACRED TIMES PRESCRIBED IN THE PENTATEUCH  
OLD TESTAMENT INDICATORS OF THE EXTENT  
OF THEIR APPLICABILITY

A dissertation  
presented in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

H. Ross Cole

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Richard M. Davidson  
Faculty Adviser,  
Richard M. Davidson  
J. N. Andrews Professor of  
Old Testament  
Interpretation

Roy E. Gane  
Roy E. Gane  
Professor of Hebrew Bible  
and Ancient Near Eastern  
Languages

Robert M. Johnston  
Robert M. Johnston  
Professor of New Testament  
and Christian Origins

Leona G. Running  
Leona G. Running  
Professor of Biblical  
Languages, Emerita

Temper Longman III  
Temper Longman III  
Professor of Old Testament  
Westminster Theological  
Seminary

Randall W. Younker  
Director of Ph.D./Th.D. Program  
Randall W. Younker

Werner K. Vyhmeister  
Dean, SDA Theological Seminary  
Werner K. Vyhmeister

May 24, 1996  
Date approved

ABSTRACT

THE SACRED TIMES PRESCRIBED IN THE PENTATEUCH:  
OLD TESTAMENT INDICATORS OF THE EXTENT  
OF THEIR APPLICABILITY

by

H. Ross Cole

Adviser: Richard M. Davidson

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE SACRED TIMES PRESCRIBED IN THE PENTATEUCH: OLD  
TESTAMENT INDICATORS OF THE EXTENT OF THEIR  
APPLICABILITY

Name of researcher: H. Ross Cole

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Richard M. Davidson,  
Th.D.

Date completed: May 1996

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the sacred times prescribed in the Pentateuch and to determine if the Old Testament itself contains indicators of the extent of their applicability. "Applicability" refers primarily to ongoing applicability throughout time. However, whether a sacred time will be universally applicable in the future may be directly related to whether it was ever meant to be universally applicable in the first place. Accordingly, this study entails a close examination of many different features of the Pentateuchal sacred times and their applicability.

Chapter 1 reviews relevant literature and describes the present investigator's methodology. On the basis of the Old Testament passages referring to these sacred times, five possible criteria are developed for establishing whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary. The first criterion concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem, the second concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo, the third concerns the identity of those who observe it, the fourth concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance, and the fifth concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times.

Chapters 2 and 3 respectively examine the relevant evidence from the Pentateuch and the evidence from the rest of the Old Testament. In both chapters the general issue of ethical versus ritual law is examined before the specific issue of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

Chapter 4 concludes that the Old Testament itself indicates the permanence of the weekly Sabbath and the temporary nature of the other Pentateuchal sacred times. The implications of these conclusions are explored for biblical theology and for Jewish-Christian dialogue.

To the memory of Dr. Arthur J. Ferch (1940-1991)  
my much-loved and much-missed mentor



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	viii
---------------------------------	------

### Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem and Justification of the Study . . . . .	1
Purpose and Scope of the Study . . . . .	4
Definition of Key Terms . . . . .	5
Review of Literature . . . . .	7
The Old Testament and the Applicability of the Pentateuchal Laws . . . . .	7
Jewish Sources . . . . .	7
Christian Sources . . . . .	14
The Old Testament and the Applicability of the Pentateuchal Sacred Times . . . . .	35
Jewish Sources . . . . .	35
Christian Sources . . . . .	40
Research Methodology and Limitations . . . . .	56
Summary . . . . .	67
II. THE EXTENT OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PENTATEUCHAL SACRED TIMES IN THE PENTATEUCH ITSELF . . . . .	70
Ethical versus Ritual Law . . . . .	70
Vertical Sanctuary Typology . . . . .	70
The Place of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy . . . . .	76
The Pentateuchal Sacred Times Considered Collectively . . . . .	85
The <span style="font-family: serif;">מועדים</span> in Gen 1:14 . . . . .	85
Weekly Sabbaths and Annual Festivals in Lev 23:37, 38 . . . . .	90
Centralization in Exod 23:17; 34:23; and Deut 16:16 . . . . .	96

The Pentateuchal Sacred Times and the Words עולם and דורות . . . . .	101
The Pentateuchal Sacred Times Considered Individually . . . . .	105
The Sabbath . . . . .	105
Gen 2:1-3 . . . . .	105
Exod 16 . . . . .	117
Exod 20:8-11 . . . . .	121
Exod 23:12 . . . . .	126
Exod 31:12-17 . . . . .	130
Exod 34:21 . . . . .	135
Exod 35:1-3 . . . . .	136
Lev 19:3, 30 . . . . .	138
Lev 23:2, 3 . . . . .	138
Lev 24:8 . . . . .	141
Lev 26:2 . . . . .	143
Num 15:32-36 . . . . .	143
Num 28:9, 10 . . . . .	145
Deut 5:12-15 . . . . .	145
The New Moon in Num 10:10 and 28:11-15 . . . . .	150
The Passover . . . . .	152
Exod 12:1-13, 21-28, and 42-50 . . . . .	152
Exod 23:18 . . . . .	157
Exod 34:25 . . . . .	158
Lev 23:5 . . . . .	158
Num 9:1-14 . . . . .	158
Num 28:16 . . . . .	163
Deut 16:1, 2, 5-7 . . . . .	163
The Festival/Feast of Unleavened Bread . . . . .	165
Exod 12:14-20 . . . . .	165
Exod 13:3-10 . . . . .	168
Exod 23:15 . . . . .	170
Exod 34:18-20 . . . . .	171
Lev 23:6-8 . . . . .	172
Num 28:17-25 . . . . .	172
Deut 16:3, 4, 8 . . . . .	172
The Festival of the Wavesheaf in Lev 23:9-14 . . . . .	178
The Festival/Feast of Harvest/Weeks . . . . .	182
Exod 23:16a . . . . .	182
Exod 34:22a . . . . .	183
Lev 23:15-22 . . . . .	184
Num 28:26-31 . . . . .	187
Deut 16:9-12 . . . . .	188
Deut 26:1-11 . . . . .	191
The Festival of Trumpets . . . . .	194
Lev 23:23-25 . . . . .	194
Num 29:1-6 . . . . .	197

The Day of Atonement . . . . .	198
Exod 30:10 . . . . .	198
Lev 16 . . . . .	198
Lev 23:26-32 . . . . .	204
Lev 25:8-10 . . . . .	205
Num 29:7-11 . . . . .	206
The Festival/Feast of Ingathering/Booths . . . . .	206
Exod 23:16b . . . . .	206
Exod 34:22b . . . . .	207
Lev 23:33-36, 39-43 . . . . .	207
Num 29:12-38 . . . . .	210
Deut 16:13-15 . . . . .	211
Deut 31:10-13 . . . . .	213
The Sabbatical Year . . . . .	215
Exod 21:2 . . . . .	215
Exod 23:10-12 . . . . .	217
Lev 25:2-7, 20-22 . . . . .	219
Lev 26:34, 35, 43 . . . . .	221
Deut 15:1-18 . . . . .	223
Deut 31:10-13 . . . . .	228
The Jubilee . . . . .	230
Lev 25:8-17, 23-54 . . . . .	230
Lev 27:16-24 . . . . .	234
Num 36:1-9 . . . . .	234
Summary . . . . .	235

III. THE EXTENT OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PENTATEUCHAL SACRED TIMES IN THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . .	243
Ethical versus Ritual Law . . . . .	243
Ps 40:6-8 (Vss. 7-9, Hebrew) . . . . .	245
Ps 110:1, 4 . . . . .	248
Isa 66:1-3 . . . . .	254
Jer 31:31-34 . . . . .	257
Dan 9:27a . . . . .	261
Interruptions to the Observance of the Pentateuchal Sacred Times . . . . .	263
The Passover . . . . .	
in Josh 5:1-10 . . . . .	263
The Day of Atonement . . . . .	
in the Historical Writings . . . . .	267
Sabbath, New Moon, or Annual Sacred Times . . . . .	
in the Eighth-Century Prophets . . . . .	271
Amos 5:21-27 . . . . .	271
Amos 8:9, 10 . . . . .	278
Hos 2:8-13 (Vss. 10-15, Hebrew) . . . . .	279
Hos 9:1-6 . . . . .	284
Isa 1:10-17 . . . . .	289
Sabbaths and Feasts . . . . .	
in Lam 1:4 and 2:6, 7 . . . . .	294

The Feasts in Joel 1:9, 13, 16 . . . . .	296
The Feasts and Mal 2:1-9 . . . . .	298
The Pentateuchal Sacred Times in the	
Eschatology of the Prophets . . . . .	301
The Sabbath in Isa 56:1-8 . . . . .	303
New Moon and Sabbath in Isa 66:22, 23 . . .	308
The Sacred Times in Ezek 45:17-46:15 . . .	310
The Festival/Feast of Booths	
in Zech 14:16-19 . . . . .	314
The Pentateuchal Sacred Times in Other	
Old Testament Passages . . . . .	317
The מועדים in Ps 104:19 . . . . .	318
The Sabbath . . . . .	318
Ezek 20:10-26 . . . . .	318
Neh 9:13, 14 . . . . .	320
Neh 10:31 and 13:15-22 . . . . .	322
The Festival of Trumpets and the	
Festival of Booths/Ingathering	
in Ps 81:3 (Vs. 4, Hebrew) . . . . .	324
The Sabbatical Year in 2 Chr 36:20, 21 . .	325
Summary . . . . .	326
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	331
APPENDIX. . . . .	360
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	378

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AB</u>	<u>Anchor Bible</u>
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
AUM	Andrews University Monographs
AUSDS	Andrews University Seminary Dissertation Series
<u>AUSS</u>	<u>Andrews University Seminary Studies</u>
<u>b.</u>	<u>Babylonian Talmud</u> , used before the title of the tractate cited
BC	Biblical Commentary
BCOT	Biblical Commentary of the Old Testament
<u>BDB</u>	<u>The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</u> , Jay P. Green, ed.
<u>BHS</u>	<u>Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u>
<u>Bib</u>	<u>Biblica</u>
BJS	Brown Judaic Series
<u>Bsac</u>	<u>Bibliotheca Sacra</u>
DARCOM	Daniel and Revelation Committee Series
EB	The Expositor's Bible
<u>EBC</u>	<u>The Expositor's Bible Commentary</u>
Herm	Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible
ICC	International Critical Commentary

<u>Int</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
<u>ISBE</u>	<u>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</u>
<u>JATS</u>	<u>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</u>
<u>JES</u>	<u>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</u>
<u>JETS</u>	<u>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</u>
<u>JSNT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</u>
<u>JSOT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</u>
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KJV	The Holy Bible, King James Version
<u>LQ</u>	<u>Lutheran Quarterly</u>
LXX	Septuagint
<u>m.</u>	<u>Mishna</u> , used before the title of the tractate cited
<u>Midr.</u>	<u>Midrash</u> , cited with usual abbreviation for biblical book, but <u>Midr. Qoh.</u> = <u>Midrash</u> <u>Qohelet</u>
NASB	The Holy Bible, New American Standard
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary, New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary, Old Testament
NIV	The Holy Bible, New International Version
NPNF	The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
OTL	Old Testament Library
1Q, 2Q, 3Q, etc.	Numbered caves of Qumran, yielding written material; followed by the number of the fragment cited

<u>Gen. Rab.</u> ,	<u>Midrash Rabbah</u> , cited with usual abbreviation
<u>Exod. Rab.</u> ,	for biblical book
etc.	
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<u>SDABC</u>	<u>Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary</u>
<u>TB</u>	<u>Tyndale Bulletin</u>
<u>TDOT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u>
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<u>TWAT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</u>
<u>TWOT</u>	<u>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</u>
<u>VE</u>	<u>Vox Evangelica</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
<u>WeslTJ</u>	<u>Wesleyan Theological Journal</u>
WSAT	Wuppertaler Studienbibel, Altes Testament
<u>WTJ</u>	<u>Westminster Theological Journal</u>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<u>y.</u>	<u>Jerusalem Talmud</u> , used before the title of the tractate cited
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
ZBAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare, Altes Testament

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem and Justification of the Study

The issue of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament laws has generally been addressed from the perspective of New Testament studies<sup>1</sup> or from that of systematic theology.<sup>2</sup> However, little attention has been given to the question of whether the Old Testament itself contains indicators as to the extent of the applicability of its laws.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Charles C. Ryrie, "The End of the Law," Bsac 124 (1967): 239-247; Jon Zens, "'This Is My Beloved Son . . . Hear Him': A Study of the Development of Law in the History of Redemption," Baptist Theological Review 7/4 (1978): 15-52; Stephen Westerholm, Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988); Craig Blomberg, "The Sabbath as Fulfilled in Christ: A Response to S. Bacchiocchi and J. Primus," in The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Traditions, ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi et al. (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991), 126.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., W. J. Larkin, Jr., Culture and Biblical Hermeneutics: Interpreting and Applying the Authoritative Word in a Relativistic Age (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988); Terrance Tiessen, "Toward a Hermeneutic for Discerning Universal Moral Absolutes," JETS 36 (1993): 189-207.



In the modern period, attention has focused on the compositional history of the legal texts and on comparative law.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, scholars still argue that the Old Testament itself does indicate the extent of the applicability of its laws. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., argues for a division between moral, ceremonial, and civil law based on the Old Testament itself:

First of all the ceremonial legislation had a built-in warning that it would only remain in effect until the real, to which it pointed, came. This built-in obsolescence was signaled in the text from the moment that the legislation on the tabernacle and its services was first given. It is contained in the word "pattern" found in Exod 25:8 [sic; should be vs. 9], 40. . . . It is no wonder then that our Lord set forth in a number of the prophetic texts a deliberate priority and ranking of the legal injunctions that had been given by Moses. For instance, Hosea depicted God as saying, "For I desire mercy, not sacrifice." Similar sentiments are expressed in Isa 1:11-17; Jer 7:21-23; Mic 6:8; 1 Sam 15:22-23; Ps 51:16-17. . . . A fair interpretation of the Bible demands that we recognize a fundamental difference between those aspects of the law that reflect God's character and those that symbolically point to the first and second coming of Christ and command only a temporary hold over believers with a stated expiration period.<sup>2</sup>

However, Kaiser's supporting evidence, although tantalizing, is brief, and is certainly worthy of further

---

<sup>1</sup>See P. J. Verdam, "Mosaic Law in Practice and Study throughout the Ages," Free University Quarterly 9 (1959): 69-78.

<sup>2</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "God's Promise Plan and His Gracious Law," JETS 33 (1990): 291. All ellipses are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

elaboration.<sup>1</sup> A lack of adequate detailed study also marks the work of most other scholars who argue that the Old Testament itself indicates the extent of the applicability of its laws.<sup>2</sup>

This lacuna is unfortunate, for this topic is directly related to the question of whether the law is a point of continuity or discontinuity between the Testaments<sup>3</sup>—a question that in turn has implications for

---

<sup>1</sup>Kaiser does elsewhere elaborate his claim that "in a number of the prophetic texts" there is "a deliberate priority and ranking of the legal injunctions . . . given by Moses." E.g., Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law," in Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1975), 182-185. He has also undertaken an excellent study on how this priority is expressed in Ps 40:6-8 (vss. 7-9, Hebrew). See idem, The Uses of the Old Testament in the New (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985), 123-141. However, further elaboration is needed.

In idem, "How Can Christians Derive Principles from the Specific Commands of the Law?" in Theory and Method, Readings in Christian Ethics, vol. 1, ed. David K. Clark and Robert V. Rakestraw (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994), 195, 196, Kaiser has proposed four promising keys for determining the moral principles informing each Old Testament law. However, in spite of the specific examples Kaiser gives of the practical application of these procedures (ibid., 196-201), there is still a need to undertake closer and more detailed exegetical studies, in order to see what indicators may emerge from the text itself of the extent of the applicability of specific Old Testament laws.

<sup>2</sup>See below, pp. 14-35.

<sup>3</sup>"Obviously the issue of law and gospel is a classic *topos* from which to test one's approach to both testaments of the Christian Bible." Brevard S. Childs, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 550.

Jewish-Christian dialogue,<sup>1</sup> as well as for biblical theology in general<sup>2</sup> and for Old Testament theology in particular.<sup>3</sup>

### Purpose and Scope of the Study

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to address the question of Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of all Old Testament law. Instead, its specific purpose is to investigate Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see below, pp. 25-28.

<sup>2</sup>Peter Stuhlmacher has proposed law as a theme for biblical theology in his essay, "Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie," in Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1981), 136-165. However, Martin Kalusche, "'Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie'? Anmerkungen zu einem Entwurf Peter Stuhlmachers," ZAW 77 (1986): 194-205, rejects this proposal on the basis of the discontinuity he sees between Old Testament and New Testament understandings of law.

On the relationship between the testaments as a major issue in biblical theology, see H. G. Reventlow, Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986), 11; Kaiser, The Uses of the Old Testament in the New, 1; Elmer A. Martens, "Embracing the Law: A Biblical Theological Perspective," Bulletin for Biblical Research 2 (1992): 1-28; Richard M. Davidson, "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," JATS 5/1 (Summer 1994): 35, n. 1. Note also the comment by Childs, 722, that "the task of the theological reflection of Biblical Theology arises from its confession of one Lord and Saviour, but as testified to in the differing notes sounded by Israel and the church."

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Gerhard F. Hasel, Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1991), 190, "One of the great turning-points in today's interest in OT theology is the reflection on the interrelationship between the Testaments."

just one crucial aspect of Old Testament law: the sacred times prescribed in the Pentateuch, hereafter simply called "the Pentateuchal sacred times."

### Definition of Key Terms

There are six different lists of sacred times in the Pentateuch: Exod 23:10-19; 34:18-26; Lev 23; 25:1-17; Num 28, 29; and Deut 16:1-17. From these lists the following composite list of Pentateuchal sacred times may be derived: the weekly Sabbath; the New Moon; Passover; the Festival/Feast of Unleavened Bread;<sup>1</sup> the Festival of the Wavesheaf; the Festival/Feast of Weeks, or of the Harvest of Firstfruits; the Festival of Trumpets;<sup>2</sup> the Day of

---

<sup>1</sup>When used for a sacred time, the term מועד has been translated throughout this dissertation as "festival" rather than as "feast," since the focus of the annual מועדים is on celebration rather than on eating and drinking. The Day of Atonement is also listed as one of them, but is traditionally observed as a fast day rather than a "feast" day. See Daniel C. Arichea, Jr., "Translating Biblical Festivals," The Bible Translator 32 (1981): 413-423.

<sup>2</sup>The word תרועה is used in connection with this festival in Lev 23:25; Num 29:1. In appropriate contexts it may be translated as "blowing an alarm." See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 1041; Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic, ed. Jay P. Green (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979), 929, 930, hereafter abbreviated as BDB. "It is also used as a shout of joy in 1 Samuel 4:5-6 and . . . for the acclamation of God as king of Israel . . . in Psalms 47 and 98:6." Jacob Milgrom, Numbers במדבר, The JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 200. However, it is never used to refer to trumpets per se. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity the

Atonement;<sup>1</sup> the Festival/Feast of Ingathering/Booths,<sup>2</sup> including the eighth day of the Feast; the Sabbatical Year; and the Jubilee.

"Applicability" refers primarily to ongoing applicability throughout time. However, whether a sacred time will be universally applicable in the future may be directly related to whether it was ever meant to be universally applicable in the first place. Accordingly, this study entails a close examination of many different

---

traditional title, "Festival of Trumpets," has been retained here.

An alternate traditional title for the Festival of Trumpets is ראש השנה or "New Year's Day." This title is appropriate, since it falls on the first day of the seventh month, the traditional date for reckoning the reigns of foreign kings. See m. Rosh HaShanah 1:1. However, the expression ראש השנה is only used once in the Old Testament, in Ezek 40:1. In this verse, the seventh month is probably in view, and the specific reference is probably to the tenth rather than to the first day of the month. See below, p. 313, n. 1. Accordingly, the Festival of Trumpets is not referred to in this dissertation as ראש השנה or "New Year's Day," unless it appears as part of a quotation or reference.

<sup>1</sup>The expression יום הכיפורים in Lev 23:27 is best translated as "Day of Purgations." Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1009. However, for the sake of clarity, the more traditional title, "Day of Atonement" (יום כיפור) has been retained here.

<sup>2</sup>The Festival/Feast of Booths is sometimes called "the Feast of Tabernacles." However, "booths" is a more precise translation of סוכה than "tabernacles." See Koehler and Baumgartner, 656, 657. Accordingly, the title "Feast of Tabernacles" is avoided in this dissertation, unless it appears in a quotation.

features of the Pentateuchal sacred times and their applicability.

The verb "to indicate" has been defined as "to be a sign of; betoken: *Snow indicates winter.*"<sup>1</sup> An indicator is thus something that points beyond itself to another fact or entity that otherwise might not be obvious. Accordingly, there may not be explicit evidence of a clearly defined terminus ad quem for any given sacred time. However, there might still be implicit clues as to whether it is permanent or temporary.

#### Review of Literature

##### The Old Testament and the Applicability of the Pentateuchal Laws

##### Jewish Sources

A number of Jewish sources anticipate either specific changes in the Torah,<sup>2</sup> a further elaboration of its details,<sup>3</sup> the cessation of some of its particular

---

<sup>1</sup>Random House Webster's College Dictionary (1992), s.v., "to indicate."

<sup>2</sup>Midr. Ps. 146:7 anticipates a future increase in the severity of the laws relating to marriage and Lev. Rab. 13:3 anticipates a new law allowing Leviathan to slay Behemoth with the saw of its fins. See W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 7 (Philadelphia, PA: SBL, 1952), 59-61.

<sup>3</sup>Current difficulties in interpretation are referred to a future prophet in 1 Macc 4:46 and 14:41, and the elaboration of the statute of the red heifer is referred to the Age to Come in Num. Rab. 19:6. See *ibid.*, 44, 68, 69. The Messiah is presented as the source of new knowledge in Testament of Benjamin 11:2 and Testament of

enactments,<sup>1</sup> the giving of a new Torah,<sup>2</sup> or even the complete abrogation of all Torah.<sup>3</sup>

---

Levi 18:9, and Elijah is presented as one who will explain points in the Torah that had long baffled the Rabbis in b. Berakoth 35b; b. Shabbath 108a; b. Pesahim 13a; and m. Shekalim 2:5. See W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, BJS, no. 186 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989), 159, 160. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 73, shows how God himself is pictured as one day giving new interpretations of the Torah in The Targum on Song of Songs 5:10. The Sectarian Rule of the Community 9:9-11 does not envisage a change in the Torah per se. However, it does anticipate a change in the community regulations that are based on the Torah. See Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, 147, 148.

<sup>1</sup>According to Lev. Rab. 9:7, all sacrifices and all prayers will one day be annulled, except for the sacrifice and the prayer of thanksgiving. See Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 54-56.

<sup>2</sup>Yalqut on Isaiah 26 clearly refers to a new Messianic Torah. See Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 74. The Targum on Isaiah 12:3 refers to a new teaching (אילפין) rather than to a new Torah per se. However, the new teaching does seem to encompass a new law. Ibid., 71. As Davies notes, the law may be included in "the making new" of The Sectarian Rule of the Community 4:25, "because the Sect was aware of tension under the Law. . . . In no other sources in first-century Judaism is failure to achieve the righteousness of the Law more recognized and at the same time its demands pressed with greater ruthlessness." Idem, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, 149, 150. However, the evidence remains indecisive. Ibid., 155.

<sup>3</sup>B. Shabbath 151b asserts that in the Messianic Age there will be "no merit and no guilt" (לא זכות ולא חובה). Admittedly, this expression may mean "that in the Messianic Age the Torah will be so fully obeyed that there will be no guilt, and so spontaneously or easily fulfilled that there will be no merit." Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 65. However, in the same context the dead are said to be free of religious duties, and so the meaning is probably that "the Torah no longer holds in the Messianic Age, so that questions of reward for observing it and guilt or punishment for refusing to do so do not arise." Ibid. See also b. Niddah 61b; Midr. Ooh. 12:1.

A special place is often assigned to the Decalogue in Alexandrian Judaism<sup>1</sup> and in Palestinian Judaism prior to the Council of Jamnia.<sup>2</sup> Later Judaism places less emphasis

---

B. Sanhedrin 97a and b. Abodah Zarah 9a both divide the history of the world into three periods: two thousand years of void; two thousand years of Torah; and two thousand years of the Messiah. This division may imply the abrogation of the law in the Messianic Age. However, the reference to the Torah may simply facilitate the distinction between the second and the third periods. See Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 78-81.

<sup>1</sup>The second century BCE Letter of Aristeas interprets the Torah in terms of the basic principles of εὐσέβεια ("godliness") and δικαιοσύνη ("righteousness"), and subordinates the laws of clean and unclean food to these two principles. See Letter of Aristeas, §131, §139, §169, §171; Günter Stemberger, "Der Dekalog im frühen Judentum," in »Gesetz« als Thema biblischer Theologie, Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, ed. Ingo Baldermann et al., vol. 4 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 91, 92.

Philo sees the Decalogue as a summary of the rest of the Law. See his On the Decalogue 154-174, and also F. E. Vokes, "The Ten Commandments in the New Testament and in First Century Judaism," in Studia Evangelica, vol. 5: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965, Part 2: The New Testament Message, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), 150. It has been claimed that in practice Philo anticipates the distinction between moral and ceremonial law. Douglas J. Moo, "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," JSNT 20 (1984): 15. This claim is probably based on the fact that Philo not only refers to the category of written law, but also to the higher categories of unwritten law (e.g., Philo On the Decalogue 2), the living law (ibid., 132), and the law of nature (idem Moses 1.4). However, for Philo these categories all have the same source and content as the written law. See John W. Martens, "The Superfluity of the Law in Philo and Paul: A Study in the History of Religions" (Ph.D. thesis, McMaster University, 1991), 156, 160, 172.

<sup>2</sup>The Decalogue has a special place in Josephus Antiquities of the Jews 3.5 and Pseudo-Philo Biblical Antiquities of Philo 11.1-15; 25.7-14; 44.6, 7. See Stemberger, 95. The importance of the Decalogue to the Qumran community is evident in the surprising number of



on the centrality of the Decalogue,<sup>1</sup> perhaps in reaction to Christian teaching.<sup>2</sup> "Nevertheless, the conceptions

---

times excerpts from Deut 5 are included on its phylacteries and mezuzoth, e.g., in 1Q 13; 4Q 128, 129, 134, 139, 140, 142. For more information see Stemberger, 95, 96; Vokes, 147, 148. A large number of Samaritan Decalogue inscriptions have been found, and so this practice is probably earlier than the split between the Jewish and Samaritan communities. E.g., see John Bowman and Shmarjahu Talmon, "Samaritan Decalogue Inscriptions," The Bulletin for the John Rylands Library Manchester 33 (1951): 211-236; Stemberger, 99. Notice also the reference to the recitation of the Decalogue in m. Tamid 5:1.

Jacques Doukhan argues that the Essenes and the Pharisees distinguish between moral and ritual law, and specifically points to the Pharisaic call for a spiritualization of the sacrificial rites. Jacques Doukhan, Drinking at the Sources: An Appeal to the Jew and the Christian to Note Their Common Beginnings, trans. Walter R. Beach and Robert M. Johnston (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Pub. Assoc., 1981), 83. See also Moo, 15. However, the Essenian separation from the Jerusalem cultus "was . . . only circumstantial and did not involve the total repudiation of sacrifice and the centrality of the holy city." Joseph M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 56. Note also the extensive focus on sacrificial offerings in The Temple Scroll. The same qualification would have to apply to any Pharisaic call for a spiritualization of the sacrificial rites.

<sup>1</sup>Notice the absence of any comment on the Decalogue in Exod. Rab. 20; Deut. Rab. 5.

<sup>2</sup>y. Berakoth 12a states that the recitation of the Decalogue before the Shema<sup>c</sup> was stopped outside of the temple because of "the insinuations of the Minim." Maurice Simon, Berakoth: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices (London: Soncino Press, 1948), 66. Simon explains that the Minim insinuated "that the Ten Commandments were the only valid part of the Torah" (*ibid.*, 66, n. 4), then in his glossary he defines a min as "a heretic . . . a member of the sect of the early Jewish Christians." *Ibid.*, 410. See also Stemberger, 100, 101; Vokes, 148; Robert M. Grant, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity," Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947): 2; Yigael Yadin, Tefillin from Qumran: (X Q Phyl 1-4) (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969), 34.

concerning the centrality of the Decalogue in Early Judaism are not totally abandoned in Rabbinic literature."<sup>1</sup>

Rabbinic Judaism also makes other attempts to determine the essence of the law.<sup>2</sup>

Recently, the Jewish scholar, Michael Wyschogrod, has suggested that Jewish-Christian relations might be

---

<sup>1</sup>"Dennoch sind die im Frühjudentum zentralen Vorstellungen zum Dekalog auch im rabbinischen Schrifttum nicht ganz untergegangen." Stemberger, 101. (All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.) Pesikta Rabbati 21-24 suggests that the Decalogue is a summary of the whole law, and Ramban cites Rashi to the effect that "all the six hundred and thirteen commandments are implicit in the Ten Commandments." Ramban (Nachmanides): Commentary on the Torah, ספר שמות Exodus, trans. and ann. Charles B. Chavel (New York: Shilo Pub. House, 1973), 431. Note also the study by Roger Brooks, The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism (San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1990), and in particular, his conclusion that "for the Talmud's authors, the overarching spirit of the Decalogue was the paramount guide to developing the law." *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>2</sup>Note Rabbi Simlai's attempt to summarize the law in increasingly fewer and more basic categories of Old Testament commands, as explained in b. Makkoth 23b, 24a. For more information, see Israel Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, First Series, Library of Biblical Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917 and 1924; reprint, New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1967), 23. Exod. Rab. 25:12 makes the Sabbath equivalent to all the commandments of the Law. Kaiser sees an anticipation of moral and ceremonial divisions in the law in the Rabbinic distinction between "light" and "heavy commandments." Kaiser, "The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law," 181, citing C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings (London: Macmillan and Co., 1930), 316, 317; Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, trans. Paul P. Levertoff (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), 64, 65. However, Montefiore includes commandments such as circumcision in the category of a "heavy" commandment, and Dalman argues that this division is virtually abolished in Matt 5:19.

improved if the "Christian debate about the law" were no longer to revolve "around the before-Jesus and after-Jesus axis."<sup>1</sup> He argues that in the past

the idea was that the law was in full effect before the coming of Jesus, but that with his coming, large parts of it were suspended. The problem then was which parts were declared inoperative and which not. This question was never answered with the requisite clarity, though not a few Christian authors have tried.

There is yet another way of looking at the problem which may be more productive for Jewish-Christian relations. Jews have long believed that the full Mosaic law was binding only on Jews. Non-Jews were duty-bound to obey the Noahide commandments, and if they did so, God was fully pleased. . . . It seems, judging from Acts 15, that the Jerusalem church was divided on this issue. One faction believed that Gentiles who wished to follow Jesus had to be circumcised and obey the Torah of the Jews, while the other faction required only faith in Jesus and obedience to the Noahide commandments. . . . It is quite clear, however, that both factions in Jerusalem agreed that Jews, even after Jesus, remained under the prescriptions of the Torah. . . . The debate concerned Gentiles; both sides agreed about the Torah obligation of Jesus-believing Jews.<sup>2</sup>

It is true that Christianity has had difficulty clearly defining which parts of the law are suspended and which are not. However, Judaism has also had difficulty clearly defining which commandments are Noahide

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael Wyschogrod, "A Jewish View of Christianity," in Toward a Theological Encounter: Jewish Understandings of Christianity, ed. Leon Klenicki, Studies in Judaism and Christianity, Exploration of Issues in the Contemporary Dialogue between Christians and Jews, A Stimulus Book (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 118.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 118, 119.

obligations,<sup>1</sup> and the New Testament does not define Gentile duty only in terms of these obligations.<sup>2</sup> There are also too many indications of a temporal dimension in the New Testament understanding of the law for Christianity to disregard "the before-Jesus and after-Jesus axis" altogether.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The standard lists of Noahide obligations each contain seven commandments, although with some minor variations. E.g., cf. B. Sanhedrin 56a,b; 59a; Gen. Rab. 16:6; Midr. Cant. 1:2:5. See also Robert M. Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," AUSS 12 (1974): 95, 96. However, Gen. Rab. 34:8 summarizes the debate over whether there should be eight commandments, and what the subject matter of an eighth commandment might be. B. Hullin 92a,b expands the list to thirty commandments, although it claims that the Gentiles actually only observe three. Peter J. Tomson, Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section 3, Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature, vol. 1 (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990), 50, notes that at the beginning of the first century three such universal commandments were realized: "the prohibition of idolatry, sexual abuse and bloodshed." He also mentions later traditions that sometimes mention four or six items, but does not cite any supporting evidence.

<sup>2</sup>Eph 6:2 specifically applies the commandment to honor one's parents to its Gentile readers, even though Abraham P. Bloch, The Biblical and Historical Background of the Jewish Holidays (New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1978), 3, states that this commandment is a "Judaic supplement" to the seven Noahide laws.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., see John 1:17; Rom 7:4-6; 2 Cor 3:1-11; Gal 3:23-25; Heb 9:8-10; Tomson, 272. Notice also Wyschogrod's own statement in his article, "The Law, Jews and Gentiles-- A Jewish Perspective," LQ 21 (1969): 408, that while "Davies . . . overrated the significance of the rabbinic texts which state or imply the transformation of the law in Messianic times, it remains a fact that there is much rabbinic inclination in that direction. That being the case, a good portion of the extra-law atmosphere in the Gospels is explainable by the conviction that the end of days had either come or was very near coming, and that a new Torah was now in effect."

The New Testament may agree with traditional Judaism when it exempts the Gentiles from the observance of the full Mosaic Law. However, it seems to go beyond traditional Judaism when it asserts that believing Gentiles are now full members of the community, despite this exemption.<sup>1</sup> It is true that Christians have too often read Paul's criticism of law as if he were writing to Jews rather than to Gentiles, for the New Testament does not expect Jewish Christians to abandon obedience to Torah.<sup>2</sup> However, the logic of the Gentile inclusion in the community is that even for Jews certain features of the law would now be optional.<sup>3</sup>

#### Christian Sources

In the early centuries of Christianity, the Decalogue played an important role in defining right and

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Rom 2:28, 29; 4:11; Gal 3:28, 29; Eph 2:11-15.

<sup>2</sup>Acts 21:17-26; Tomson, 3.

<sup>3</sup>Notice the reference in Gal 2:14 to Cephas being a Jew yet living as a Gentile. As Frank B. Holbrook, "Should Christians Observe the Israelite Festivals? A Brief Statement of SDA Understanding" (Prepared for the Biblical Research Institute, July, 1987), 3, comments concerning the decision of the Jerusalem Council, "Nothing was said about Jewish Christians. . . . However, eventually it would be reasoned that if a Gentile Christian could be saved without observing the [ceremonial] rites, so could a Jewish Christian."

wrong,<sup>1</sup> although a distinct Old Testament exegetical basis is not always provided for giving it such primacy.

However, some interpreters do distinguish sharply between the laws given before the worship of the golden calf and those given afterwards. Irenaeus comments that

God at the first, indeed, warning them [the Jews] by means of . . . the Decalogue . . . did then demand nothing more of them. As Moses says in Deuteronomy, "These are all the words which the Lord spake to the whole assembly of the sons of Israel on the mount, and He added no more; and He wrote them on two tables of stone, and gave them to me." [Deut 5:22] . . . But when they turned themselves to make a calf, and had gone back in their minds to Egypt . . . they were placed for the future in a state of servitude suited to their wish, . . . as Ezekiel the prophet . . . declares: "And their eyes were after the desire of their heart; and I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments in which they shall not live," [Ezek 20:25].<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, notice the importance of the Ten Commandments in the gnostic writing, Ptolemy Letter to Flora 5.3, and in orthodox writings, such as Irenaeus Against Heresies 15.1 and 16.3 (ANF, 1:479, 481); Clement of Alexandria The Stromata, or Miscellanies 16 (ANF, 2:511-515); Tertullian On Idolatry 4, 5, 20 (ANF, 3:62, 64, 74); idem On Modesty 5 (ANF, 4:77, 78); Theophilus to Autolyctus 3.9 (ANF, 2:111-114); Constitutions of the Holy Apostles 2.5.26 and 6.4.20-23 (ANF, 7:413, 458-461; Pseudo-Clement Recognitions of Clement 3.55 (ANF, 8:128); Augustine On the Spirit and the Letter 24 (NPNF, 1st ser., 5:93); idem 3.10 Against Two Letters of the Pelagians (NPNF, 1st ser., 5:406); idem Sermon 33 6 (NPNF, 1st ser., 6:364); Chrysostom Concerning the Statutes: Homily 12 9 (NPNF, 1st ser., 9:421, 422). However, a number of these writings exclude the literal observance of the Sabbath, at the same time as they affirm the ongoing applicability of the Ten Commandments. E.g., Ptolemy 5.8; Irenaeus 16:2 (ANF, 1:481); Tertullian An Answer to the Jews 4 (ANF, 3:155, 156); Augustine Against Two Letters of the Pelagians (NPNF, 1st ser., 5:406).

<sup>2</sup>Irenaeus Against Heresies 4. 15 (ANF, 1:479).

The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles also affirm the permanent validity of the Decalogue, since it is promulgated before the worship of the golden calf.<sup>1</sup> Before the worship of the golden calf, sacrifice is merely permitted, but afterwards it is positively required. Accordingly, it is argued that the law of the altar in Exod 20:24 "does not say, 'Make one [an altar],' but 'If thou wilt make.' It does not impose a necessity, but gives leave to their own free liberty."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, after the worship of the golden calf, God became angry, and bound them [the Israelites] with bonds which could not be loosed, with a mortifying burden and a hard collar, and no longer said, "If thou makest," but, "Make an altar," and sacrifice perpetually; for thou art forgetful and ungrateful.<sup>3</sup>

The conclusion is then drawn that in Christ "you are released from the bonds, and freed from the servitude."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Constitutions of the Holy Apostles 6.4.20 (ANF, 7:458).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 459.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. A similar distinction is made by Athanasius Letter 19: Easter, 347 4 (NPNF, 2d ser., 4:545): "Accordingly, the whole law did not treat of sacrifices, though there was in the law a commandment concerning sacrifices, that by means of them it might begin to instruct men and might withdraw them from idols, and bring them near to God, teaching them for that present time. . . . But when they chose to serve Baal, . . . then indeed, after the law, that commandment concerning sacrifices was ordained as law."

Irenaeus and the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles have overstated their case.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, they have pointed out an important area for further consideration, because the Decalogue is uniquely the direct, unmediated word of God to Israel. Likewise, Israel's relationship with God is clearly pictured as being "fundamentally affected by their 'great sin' of worshiping the golden calf,"<sup>2</sup> and affected in ways that illustrate the changeability of certain aspects of Old Testament law.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>First, the statutes and judgments of Ezek 20:25 permit the unlawful practice of child sacrifice (vs. 26), a custom that "could never be described as an ordinance of God." John B. Taylor, Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (London: Tyndale Press, 1969; 2d American Printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), 159. These verses should probably be understood "in the manner of Romans 1:24, which is saying that the consequence of spiritual perversity is that God 'gives men up' to grosser sins." Ibid.

Second, according to Exod 12:3-10, 43-49, the future offering of the Passover is commanded before Israel has even left Egypt.

Third, the conditional statement of Exod 20:25 only concerns the building of a stone altar, and not the necessity of building an altar per se. In fact, in vs. 24 the building of an altar and the prohibition against making idols are stated with equal forcefulness.

Fourth, in the final form of the text, the offering of the bread of the presence; the building of the bronze altar; the offering of the evening and morning sacrifices; and the offering of incense from the altar of incense are all commanded before the worship of the golden calf is reported.

<sup>2</sup>John H. Sailhamer, The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, Academic and Professional books, 1992), 313.

<sup>3</sup>See below, p. 75.



Chrysostom proposes internal indicators of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament law. He argues that the Sabbath commandment is only temporary because it has a reason attached to it, unlike "the leading commandments" against killing, adultery, and stealing, all of which contain only a "bare prohibition."<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the prohibitions against worshiping a graven image; taking the name of Yahweh in vain; and coveting, all contain substantial elaboration, as does the commandment to honor one's parents. However, Chrysostom nowhere concludes that these are temporary. Indeed, it could be argued that such commandments are elaborated on precisely because they are permanent, even though they are frequently forgotten.<sup>2</sup>

Chrysostom recognizes how a prescribed geographical location may imply a limitation to the applicability of a Pentateuchal law, when he speaks of God "shutting up its [the law's] sacrifices and its whole ritual . . . in one place, the Temple, and afterwards destroying this."<sup>3</sup> He

---

<sup>1</sup>Chrysostom Concerning the Statutes: Homily 12 9 (NPNF, 1st ser., 9:422).

<sup>2</sup>Bruce K. Waltke, "Theonomy in Relation to Dispensational and Covenant Theologies," in Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1990), 84.

<sup>3</sup>Chrysostom Homilies on 2 Corinthians: Homily 7, 2 Cor 3:7, 8 (NPNF, 1st ser., 12:312). See also below, pp. 96-101, 162, 288.

also points to the law of the prophet in Deut 18:15, 19, as an indicator of the temporary nature of the law.<sup>1</sup>

It is probably out of the emphasis on the Decalogue that the teaching of Thomas Aquinas on three distinct kinds of precepts emerges: moral precepts of a universal and permanent nature, ceremonial law abrogated in Christ, and judicial law, whose application to the contemporary situation is not always immediately clear.<sup>2</sup>

Aquinas's basis for these distinctions is ultimately more philosophical than exegetical.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. See below, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup>Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae, Part I-II, Q. 99. See also Verdam, 45, 46, 56.

<sup>3</sup>Aquinas classifies all moral precepts as a part of natural law. However, he does not claim that all of them are automatically accessible to human reason. In matters such as the prohibition of the worship of graven images and the taking of the name of the Lord in vain, he explicitly states that human reason needs specific divine instruction. Ibid., Part I-II, Q. 100, 2. On the other hand, he seems to identify moral law with the unaided deductions of human reason when he distinguishes between the moral nature of the requirement to set aside one day in seven for the things of God and the ceremonial nature of the requirement to set aside the specific seventh day. Ibid., Part I-II, Q. 100, 3. For a critique of the inconsistency of Aquinas, see Samuele Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest for Human Restlessness: A Theological Study of the Good News of the Sabbath for Today (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1980), 45, 46. "That there is a natural and universal awareness of . . . law is beyond doubt. The *consensus gentium* attests it, and Paul explicitly teaches it in Romans 1 and 2." Henry Stob, "Natural Law Ethics: An Appraisal," Calvin Theological Journal 20 (1985): 59. However, apart from special revelation humankind cannot have "an adequate knowledge of the single moral law under which it resides." Ibid., 60.

Verdam, 45, sees a faint anticipation of Aquinas's tripartition of the law in Ambrosius Commentaries in

Nevertheless, he does see Old Testament support for them in Deut 6:1, where he identifies "the commandment" (המצוה) with moral law, "the statutes" (החקים) with ceremonial law, and "the judgments" (המשפטים) with judicial law.<sup>1</sup> However, "the commandment" in Deut 6:1 stands in apposition to "the statutes and the judgments" that follow, rather than designating a separate category of precepts:

וואת המצוה החקים והמשפטים אשר צוה יהוה אלהיכם ללמד אתכם  
לעשת בארץ אשר אתם עברים שמה לרשתה

And this [is] the commandment—the statutes and the judgments<sup>2</sup>—that Yahweh your God has commanded [me] to

---

epistolam ad Romanos, in Migne's Patrologia 17:82, 98. Ambrosius, like Aquinas, has a natural law, which is reformed and confirmed by Moses. However, the three divisions he elaborates in each of these passages are otherwise difficult to correlate with Aquinas's partition.

The distinction drawn in Ptolemy 5:1-8; 6:1-4 between the pure legislation of the Decalogue, the now abrogated lex talionis, and the transcendently fulfilled typical and symbolic aspects of the law, roughly corresponds to the distinction Aquinas later draws between moral, judicial, and ceremonial law. However, Ptolemy's distinctions are based on a schema of gnostic cosmological and soteriological myth, rather than on any internal Old Testament hermeneutic. E.g., see Gilles Quispel's comments in his introductory analysis to Ptolemy, Lettre à Flora, trans. and ed. Gilles Quispel, 2d ed., sources chrétiennes (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1966), 26-28.

<sup>1</sup>Aquinas, Part I-II, Q. 99, 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup>Against the Massoretic Text and the Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX reads the expression החקים והמשפטים as standing syndectically in relationship to המצוה, leading to the translation, "the commandments and the statutes and the judgments." However, this reading is unlikely since it also involves reading the singular expression וואת המצוה ["this (is) the commandment"] as if it were plural ["these (are) the commandments"]. For more information see Norbert

teach you to do in the land that you are about to go over and inherit.

In modern scholarship, the term "statutes" (חֻקִּים) is sometimes identified with apodictic law and the term "judgments" (מִשְׁפָּטִים) with casuistic law,<sup>1</sup> and certainly, "the so-called 'judicial' precepts correspond very roughly to the modern biblical scholar's idea of 'casuistic laws.'"<sup>2</sup> However, whatever the general distinctions between these two terms, they here simply seem to be used as synonyms for the precepts that follow.<sup>3</sup>

---

Lohfink, "Die *ḥuqqim ūmišpāṭim* im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bib* 70 (1989): 2.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Claus Westermann, Elements of Old Testament Theology, trans. Douglas W. Scott (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1982), 177-180.

<sup>2</sup>Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, vol. 29, The Old Law (1a2ae. 98-105), trans. David Bourke and Arthur Littledale (Westminster: Blackfriars, 1969), 42, n. 8.

<sup>3</sup>The expression כל החקים האלה ("all these statutes") in Deut 6:24 is parallel to the expression כל המצוה הזאת ("all this commandment") in vs. 25, already defined as החקים והמשפטים ("the statutes and the judgments") in vs. 1. The expression אה המצוה ואחד החקים ואחד המשפטים ("the commandment and the statutes and the judgments") in Deut 7:11 is parallel to the expression אה המשפטים האלה ("these judgments") in vs. 12.

Outside Deuteronomy, the instruction to obey the divine חק and משפט in Lev 18:3-5, 26 forms an inclusio around vss. 6-25, but these intervening verses contain no casuistic laws. The use of the designation חק משפט ("a statute of judgment") in Num 27:11 and 35:29 also illustrates that a sharp distinction cannot always be drawn between חק and משפט, as does the designation of a single apodictic law as both a חק and a משפט in 1 Sam 30:25 and in Ps 81:4 (vs. 5, Hebrew). See George V. Wigram, The New

Luther sometimes strongly affirms the continuing validity of the Decalogue as moral law.<sup>1</sup> However, at other times he presents it as remaining valid only insofar as it agrees with natural reason.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, his basis for distinguishing moral and ceremonial law, like that of Aquinas, is ultimately more philosophical than exegetical.

In the case of Calvin's discussion of Pentateuchal law, it is of special interest to note what he wants to keep "quite literally, what he wants to drop entirely and how he finds a constant parallel between the problems of Israel and those of his beloved Genevans."<sup>3</sup> However, when it comes to determining which commands should still be kept literally,

---

Englishman's Hebrew Concordance: Coded to Strong's Concordance Numbering System, rev. Jay P. Green (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984), 776, 777; Lohfink, 5, 6.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Martin Luther, "The Large Catechism," 1529, I, 311, 317, 330-332; III, 1-2; V, 85; in The Book of Concord, trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1959), 407, 408, 410, 420, 456. For more information see Walter H. Wagner, "Luther and the Positive Use of the Law," Journal of Religious History 11 (1980): 49-61.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Luther's Works, American ed., vol. 35, Word and Sacrament, I, ed. E. Theodore Bachman (Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), 165-168; Luther's Works, American ed., vol. 40, Church and Ministry, II, ed. Conrad Bergendoff (Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), 96-98. For more information, see Daniel Augsburger, "Calvin and the Mosaic Law," 2 vols. (DSR thesis, Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg: Faculté de théologie protestante, 1976), 1:126, 252.

<sup>3</sup>Augsburger, 1:30.

we fail to find much hermeneutical consistency except in the fact that he [Calvin] tends to give permanent significance to laws that support him against his opponents. . . . On the other hand when the same Mosaic laws are used against the Genevan practice he dismisses them rather readily.<sup>1</sup>

Puritanism is not characterized by natural law, but instead adheres strongly to the Old Testament laws. Nevertheless, when Puritanism is reflected in concrete legal provisions, the selective use of Old Testament prescriptions clearly reveals the lack of an adequately developed hermeneutic for distinguishing between the permanent and temporary features of the law.<sup>2</sup>

John Wesley places great stress on the traditional distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law, claiming that "there are few subjects within the whole

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 1:472, 473. Calvin uses the command for a centralized cultus as an argument against the private chapels of Catholics, even as he justifies the multiplication of Protestant temples. John Calvin, Corpus Reformatorum, vol. 56, Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia (Brunsvigae: Apud C. A. Schwetschke et Filium: 1885; first reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1964; Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, G.m.b. H., 1964), 252b; *ibid.*, Corpus Reformatorum, vol. 28, Sermons sur le Deuteronomie. Part four (sur les chapitres xxii.-xxxii., 19) (Brunsvigae: Apud C. A. Schwetschke et Filium: 1885; first reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1964; Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, G.m.b. H., 1964), 301bc.

<sup>2</sup>The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts, reprinted from the copy of the 1648 ed. in the Henry E. Huntington Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), is a self-proclaimed model of the judicial laws of Moses (*ibid.*, A2). However, its formulations are often guided more by the concerns of the seventeenth century than by Old Testament exegesis. One example is its legislation governing procedures for community elections (*ibid.*, 20, 21). For more information, see Verdam, 63-68.

compass of religion so little understood as this."<sup>1</sup> However, on the question of the exact content of the moral law, "he is vague at best,"<sup>2</sup> variously defining it as the law of love,<sup>3</sup> the Sermon on the Mount,<sup>4</sup> or the Decalogue.<sup>5</sup> Certainly, precision in establishing exegetical indicators of the presence of moral law cannot be expected, when even the question of its exact content remains undefined. So once again, no clear hermeneutic is evident for distinguishing between permanent and temporary features of the law.

Verdam has rejected any partitioning of the law and has claimed that "very few people indeed" now believe the law applies to Christians.<sup>6</sup> However, this evaluation is premature, because the time period since Verdam wrote in 1959 has witnessed the rise of "theonomy," a position that advocates "that Old Testament standing laws continue to be morally binding in the New Testament, unless they are

---

<sup>1</sup>Wesley's Standard Sermons, 2 vols., ed. Edmund H. Sugden (London: Epworth Press, 1951), 2:38. For more information, see Kenneth J. Collins, "John Wesley's Platonic Conception of the Moral Law," WeslTJ 21 (1986): 124, 125.

<sup>2</sup>John N. Oswalt, "Wesley's Use of the Old Testament in His Doctrinal Teachings," WeslTJ 12 (1977): 46.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Wesley's Standard Sermons, 1:125.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 1:404-410.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 2:41. For further information, see Collins, 117.

<sup>6</sup>Verdam, 78, 79.

rescinded or modified by further revelation."<sup>1</sup> In fact, this position is one of the strongest affirmations of the continuing applicability of Old Testament law ever to appear in Christian circles.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, theonomy ironically ultimately disregards the issue of Old Testament indicators just as much as does the reverse position, that all the Old Testament law is canceled unless it is reenacted in the New Testament. The reason is that ultimately both positions accept only the New Testament as their indicator of applicability, even though they use it in directly opposite ways. The interpreters who must deal more seriously with the Old Testament on its own terms are those who advocate a mediating position.

In the wake of the Holocaust, there is a growing recognition by Christians of the need to reevaluate many of their traditional theological formulations vis-à-vis

---

<sup>1</sup>Greg L. Bahnsen, By This Standard: The Authority of God's Law Today (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1985), 345. Bahnsen defines "standing law" as "policy directives applicable over time to classes of individuals . . . in contrast to particular directions for an individual . . . or positive commands for distinct incidents." Ibid., 346, n. 1. Notice also the advocacy of theonomy by Rousas J. Rushdoony, Institutes of Biblical Law (Phillipsburg, NJ: Craig Press, 1973).

<sup>2</sup>James B. Jordan, Reconsidering the Mosaic Law: Some Reflections--1988, Biblical Horizons Occasional Paper, no. 4, 2d ed. (Tyler, TX: Biblical Horizons, 1989), 12.



Judaism,<sup>1</sup> including traditional formulations of the role of the law.

First, in contrast to traditional law/gospel polemic, it is increasingly acknowledged that "Law (torah) in the Old Testament usage is in its whole semantic range quite parallel to Gospel—and certainly not its antonym!"<sup>2</sup>

Second, recent research has shown that

the claim of Paul to preach nothing but the righteousness of God according to the Law and the Prophets (Rom. 3:21; cf. 1:16-17) looks no longer like wishful thinking on Paul's part. It has become probable that each and every element in Paul's teaching ought to be checked primarily against its roots in the history and canon of Israel and explained only in the light of that background.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen R. Haynes, Prospects for Post-Holocaust Theology, American Academy of Religion Series, no. 77 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 285, states that "in the past, theology could be 'wrong about the Jews' . . . and still be 'good theology.' This is no longer possible for post-Holocaust theology. For the Holocaust itself teaches us that theology which is wrong about the Jews may lead to evils so great that they overwhelm any other advantages of such a theology and render it nearly useless."

<sup>2</sup>Horace D. Hummel, "Law and Grace in Judaism and Lutheranism," LQ 21 (1969): 417. See also Haynes, 10; Paul M. van Buren, A Theology of the Jewish-Christian Reality, part 2, A Christian Theology of the People Israel, paperback ed. (San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, 1987), 210-212, 284, 285; Norbert Lohfink, The Covenant Never Revoked: Biblical Reflections on Christian-Jewish Dialogue, trans. John J. Scullion (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 94-96.

<sup>3</sup>Markus Barth, Israel and the Church: Contribution to a Dialogue Vital for Peace, Research in Theology (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1969), 60, citing Paul's respective understandings of God's saving righteousness, of the relationship between law and covenant, and of Gen 12:1-3.

Third, "in the earlier (Wellhausenian) days of criticism, it was fashionable to argue that developed ideas of covenant, law, cultus, etc., were signs of a late, institutionalized and hence decadent culture."<sup>1</sup> However, there is now an abundance of scholarly activity "drawing attention to the fact that the legal tradition is a living tradition," and "slowly laying to rest the long held notion that a law-centered religion is necessarily legalistic."<sup>2</sup>

Fourth, there is a new recognition that while the New Testament considers that many Old Testament legal prescriptions do not apply to Gentile Christians, it still allows for their continued observance by Jews, and considers them to be valid for Jews. Furthermore, even for Gentile Christians, it is increasingly realized that the New Testament still considers some of the Old Testament legal norms to be valid.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hummel, 418.

<sup>2</sup>Christiana van Houten, The Alien in Israelite Law, JSOTSS, no. 107 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 12, 13. See also G. J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1979); J. G. McConville, Law and Theology in Deuteronomy, JSOTSS, no. 33 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

<sup>3</sup>Hans Küng, Judaism: Between Yesterday and Tomorrow (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1992), 500. van Buren, 34, claims that "the fundamental meaning of the Jewish No, which the church should understand therefore, is that it was from the beginning and continues to be an act of fidelity to Torah and Torah's God. . . . Israel said No to Jesus Christ out of faithfulness to his Father, the God of Israel." See also Tomson, 50, 51; Barth, 61-64; Gerard S. Sloyan, "Faith and Law: An Essay toward Jewish-Christian Dialogue," JES 18 (1981): 101; Wyschogrod, "A Jewish View

Fifth, while the "unsystematic nature of the Jewish literature makes it quite possible to find certain statements which by themselves sound frightfully legalistic," there is a growing awareness that there are also many "countervailing statements extolling and exploring God's grace."<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that engagement in Jewish-Christian dialogue has led some Christian interpreters to an emerging consensus concerning the value of Old Testament law. However, no clear agreement seems to have emerged as to how the universal core of the Torah's prescriptions might be defined.<sup>2</sup>

---

of Christianity," 118, 119.

<sup>1</sup>Hummel, 422. This is essentially Brooks's thesis. See also E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977).

<sup>2</sup>Küng shows confusion as to the identity of this core when he sometimes defines it in terms of Noachide commandments (Küng, 32-34) and at other times he speaks in terms of the Decalogue (ibid., 486) as if the two sets of commandments were the same.

Lohfink, Covenant, 95, argues that "details in the shape of the torah may change. . . . But one thing holds always: that dimension of the torah that covers 'God's people' must remain, its alternative character standing over against those models of society of a world that has fallen away from the original design of creation." Lohfink thus defines the universal core of the law by an appeal to "the original design of creation," rather than by an appeal to the Noachide commandments per se. Elsewhere he has defined the core in terms of the Decalogue, accepting the traditional Christian distinction between moral and ceremonial law as a valid way of affirming the Decalogue's special place. Idem, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied von »Gebot« und »Gesetz«? Zur bibel-theologischen Einstufung des Dekalogs," in »Gesetz« als

A number of scholars continue to divide the law into moral, ceremonial, and judicial/civil components,<sup>1</sup> or

---

Thema Biblischer Theologie, Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, ed. Ingo Baldermann et al., vol. 4 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 63-89. Doukhan, 82, identifies the ongoing moral law with the law of the Decalogue placed inside the ark of the covenant, and the transitory ceremonial law with the book placed beside the ark, and so has a position close to Lohfink's.

Sloyan, 102, rejects any distinction between ethical and ceremonial law, instead arguing that the universal core may be identified by "seeking God's intent in keeping the Law and then conforming to that intent." However, he does not clarify a hermeneutic for arriving at the divine intent of the law. See also Hummel, 424, 428.

van Buren, 238, may be correct in affirming that "the church is . . . called to be attentive but not subject to Torah," for "the church is called to let itself be shaped by Christ, even as Israel is called to let itself be shaped by the Torah." Ibid., 239. "The Gentile church has its relationship to Torah by means of holding onto Jesus Christ in his obedience to God and as the church's authoritative teacher (rabbi) who interprets God's commandments to them." Ibid., 238. However, he inconsistently limits the applicability of Jesus' affirmations of "the importance of fidelity to Torah" to Israel in passages such as Matt 5:18-19; Mark 10:17-19; Luke 10:25. Ibid., 231.

<sup>1</sup>The position of Kaiser, "God's Promise Plan," 289-302, has already been noted above, p. 2. See also Waltke, 67-69, 73; C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law," Scottish Journal of Theology 17 (1964): 67; Klaus Berger, Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament, part 1, Markus und Parallelen, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 40 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 173; Robert H. Stein, The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1978), 102-104; J. H. Gerstner, "Law in the NT," ISBE, rev. ed. (1986), 3:85; Desmond Ford, The Forgotten Day (Angwin, CA: Desmond Ford Publications, 1981), 189; Bernard S. Jackson, "The Ceremonial and the Judicial: Biblical Law as Sign and Symbol," JSOT 30 (1984): 25-50; Sidney Greidanus, "The Universal Dimension of Law in the Hebrew Scriptures," Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses 14 (1985): 49; G. J. Wenham, "The Perplexing Pentateuch," VE 17 (1987): 7-21; Robert D. Bergen, "Preaching Old Testament Law," in Reclaiming the Prophetic Mantle: Preaching the Old

at least into moral/ethical and ceremonial/ritual elements.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, many of them do so partly on the

---

Testament Faithfully, ed. George L. Klein (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992), 65; Christopher J. Wright, "The Ethical Authority of the Old Testament: A Survey of Approaches--Part II," TB 43 (1992): 203-231, who claims to have been specifically persuaded by the argument of Kaiser's "God's Promise Plan." See Wright, 205. The tripartition of the law has even become apparent in progressive dispensationalism. See John A. Martin, "Christ the Fulfillment of the Law in the Sermon on the Mount," in Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for a Definition, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs., 1992), 262. Childs, 563, doubts that "any one attempt of the past" has fully answered the question adequately, "How does Old Testament law function within the context of the Christian Bible?" Nevertheless, he insists that attention should be given to "the reasons why the church has judged the ceremonial and juridical laws obsolete in the light of the event of Jesus Christ." *Ibid.*, 564.

<sup>1</sup>In addition to Doukhan, 82, and Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 63-89, see Moo, 15; Christoph Haufe, "Die Stellung des Paulus zum Gesetz," Theologische Literaturzeitung 91 (1966): 171-178; George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1974), 510; D. P. Fuller, "Paul and the Works of the Law," WTJ 38 (1975): 38, 39; R. K. Harrison, "Law in the OT," ISBE, rev. ed. (1986), 3:85; David Wenham, "Jesus and the Law: An Exegesis on Matthew 5:17-20," Them 4 (1979): 92-96; Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1980), 361, 362; Cain H. Felder, "Partiality and God's Law: An Exegesis of James 2:1-13," Journal of Religious Thought 39/2 (Fall-Winter, 1982-83): 66; R. H. Gundry, "Grace, Works and Staying Saved in Paul," Bib 66 (1985): 1-38; Thomas Edward McComiskey, The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1985), 84, 85; Roger T. Beckwith, "The Unity and Diversity of God's Covenants," TB 38 (1987): 108, 117; Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul," JSNT 35 (1989): 47-74; J. Daryl Charles, "The Greatest or the Least in the Kingdom? The Disciple's Relationship to the Law (Matt 5:17-20)," Trinity Journal 13 (1992): 139-162; Frank Thielman, "The Coherence of Paul's View of the Law: The Evidence of First Corinthians," NTS 38

basis of the Old Testament, although the question of Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament law has still not been adequately addressed. Kaiser's Old Testament arguments are tantalizingly brief.<sup>1</sup> Jackson maintains that the Old Testament itself draws a distinction between moral, ceremonial, and judicial law.<sup>2</sup> However, he does not cite specific biblical examples in support of the semiotic methodology he proposes, and ultimately seems to rely solely on his own subjective response to the text in general.

The moral law has been identified with the Decalogue; the judicial or civil law with the Covenant Code; and the ceremonial law with the subsequent instructions concerning the sanctuary in Exodus and Leviticus.<sup>3</sup> Certainly, the Decalogue has some distinctive features vis-à-vis the rest of the law.<sup>4</sup> However, the Pentateuch itself does not support the neat separation of moral, judicial, and ceremonial law into three distinct legal corpora. As Shalom Paul comments:

---

(1992): 235-253. In dispensational circles, see Charles Lee Feinberg, "Jeremiah," EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin, Regency Reference Library (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1986), 6:431.

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Jackson, 25-50.

<sup>3</sup>Ford, 189; Waltke, 70-72.

<sup>4</sup>See the summary offered by Doukhan, 82, 83.

The whole of one's life is now directly related to the will of God. . . . Man's civil, moral and religious obligations all ultimately stem from God, and hence are interwoven within a single corpus of divinely given law. These three realms, which in extra-biblical societies would be incorporated respectively in law collections, wisdom literature, and priestly handbooks, are here combined into one body of prescriptions.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, an argument might still be made from the different emphases of different law codes. J. A. Thompson offers the following translation of Jer 7:22, 23:

*For in the day when I brought your fathers out of the land of Egypt I did not speak to them or give them a command concerning the details of burnt offering and sacrifice. But this I commanded them: "Obey my voice, and I will be your God and you shall be my people. You*

---

<sup>1</sup>Shalom M. Paul, Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 18 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 30. "The legal texts of Israel not only contain cultic law but are cultic in their orientation, even when civil or criminal law is discussed." John H. Walton, Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts, Regency Reference Library (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1989), 233. See also William W. Hallo, "New Moons and Sabbaths: A Case-Study in the Contrastive Approach," Hebrew Union College Annual 48 (1977): 16. According to both Matt 22:39 and Mark 12:31, the command to love one's neighbor as one's self in Lev 19:18 is one of the two great commandments of the law, although Leviticus is generally classified as primarily moral rather than ceremonial law. Any attempt to distinguish too sharply between the judicial nature of the Covenant Code and the ceremonial nature of the Holiness Code is also weakened by the parallels between them. As noted by C. W. Kiker, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament Cult" (Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1968), 101, both codes are "marked by an introductory section concerning the place of sacrifice and a concluding blessing and curse section."

must live in the way I commanded you so that it may go well with you."<sup>1</sup>

He then comments:

The reference point is the time of the Exodus when, following Yahweh's mighty acts of deliverance from Egypt, Israel accepted him as their sovereign lord, entered into his covenant, and accepted the covenant obligations with the words, "All that Yahweh has spoken we will do" (Exod. 19:8). A reading of Exod. 19:3-8 makes it clear that the first step in the covenant ceremony was Yahweh's demand for the unconditional acceptance of the covenant. The Decalog [gic] is spelled out in Exod. 20:1-17, but at no point is the narrative concerned with cultic details. It was only after the covenant had been ratified (24:1-8) that the cultic details of the tabernacle, the priesthood, and the sacrifices were declared. . . . Jeremiah was really indicating that the order of revelation was indicative of the relative value of obedience and cultic observances.<sup>2</sup>

However, the Levitical laws are ostensibly given at Mount Sinai (Lev 27:34). Accordingly, it is an artificial contrivance to date the giving of the Decalogue and the Covenant Code to the day Yahweh brought the fathers out of Egypt, then to date the giving of cultic details to a separate period.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Thompson, The Book of Jeremiah, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1980), 286, italics his, underlining mine.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 287, 288, emphasis mine. See also C. F. Keil, The Prophecies of Jeremiah, vol. 1, trans. David Patrick and James Kennedy, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1956), 161, 162. "God's essential demands did not concern ritual matters, but the keeping of the Covenant stipulations." John Bright, Jeremiah, AB, vol. 21 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1965), 57.

<sup>3</sup>Whenever the words עלה and זבח are used together, the reference is always to voluntary rather than mandatory



Lohfink tries to test whether the Old Testament itself affirms the perpetuity of the Ten Commandments and the historical relativity of the rest of its laws,<sup>1</sup> and argues persuasively that it indeed does. However, there is

---

offerings. E.g., see Exod 18:12; Lev 17:8; 22:17-25; Num 15:1-16; Deut 12:11; Josh 22:26, 28; 2 Kgs 5:17; 2 Chr 29:31; Isa 56:7; and Jacob Milgrom, "Concerning Jeremiah's Repudiation of Sacrifice," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 273-275. Milgrom therefore concludes, "Perhaps the priestly legislators would have been offended by the prophet's abrasive tone, but as for his claim that *ʿolā* and *zoebāh* [*sic*] were not commanded by the covenant, they would have had no choice but to agree." Ibid., 273, 274. However, Jer 7:22 does not just claim that such offerings are not commanded by the covenant. It also claims that on the day Yahweh brought the fathers out of Egypt he said nothing to them at all about them, and Milgrom himself notes instructions concerning *עולה* and *זבח* in such passages as Lev 17:8; 22:17-25; and Num 15:1-21. Ibid., 273.

The best interpretation of Jer 7:22, 23 is probably that it employs "'not' figuratively as a form of hyperbolic verbal irony intended to intensify the contrast between what is present in the mind of the audience and what ought to be present." G. E. Whitney, "Alternative Interpretations of *לֹא* in Exodus 6:3 and Jeremiah 7:22," *WTJ* 48 (1986): 152, citing Gen 45:7, 8; Exod 16:8; Josh 17:17; 1 Sam 8:7; 20:14, 15; Job 2:10; Jer 16:14, 15; Ezek 16:47; Hos 6:6. In this case, the meaning of the passage would be that when Yahweh brought the fathers out of Egypt, he did not only speak to them about the details of burnt offering and sacrifice, he also called for obedience to his voice. It thus places a priority on what the law requires rather than what it merely permits and encourages, rather than drawing a general line of distinction between ethical and ritual law.

<sup>1</sup>"The question will be discussed here neither on the basis of the New Testament, nor on the basis of the Christian exegesis contained in it, but only from the perspective of the Old Testament itself." ("Die Frage soll hier weder vom Neuen Testament noch von der daran anschließenden christlichen Auslegung und ihren inneren Prinzipien her diskutiert werden, sondern nur im Horizont des Alten Testaments selbst.") Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 65.

still a need to investigate the extent of the applicability of the different prescriptions of various legal corpora on an individual basis. "Old Testament laws must be studied individually and sensitively to see precisely how they should be applied to our modern societies."<sup>1</sup>

Clearly, the question of internal indicators of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament law remains an open one. This dissertation specifically addresses this question with reference to a crucial aspect of Old Testament law: that of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

#### The Old Testament and the Applicability of the Pentateuchal Sacred Times

##### Jewish Sources

In Jewish sources generally, no terminus ad quem is explicitly envisaged for the observance of the Pentateuchal sacred times.<sup>2</sup> However, in practice, Judaism has often recognized that there may be no Old Testament authority for the continued observance of certain aspects of the Pentateuchal sacred times, especially in view of the destruction of the temple and of the end of the sacrificial

---

<sup>1</sup>Tremper Longman III, "God's Law and Mosaic Punishments Today," in Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1990), 54. For an evaluation of Lohfink's proposal, see below, pp. 78-80.

<sup>2</sup>An exception is the Yalqut on Prov 9:2, which claims that all festivals will cease in the Messianic Age, except for Purim and the Day of Atonement. See Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 56, 57.

system. Accordingly, the New Moon festival today has scarcely any liturgical impact,<sup>1</sup> and modern Jews do not observe the Sabbatical Year or the Jubilee. Passover observance has continued, but it remains an open question as to whether the obligation to eat matzah (unleavened bread) now rests on biblical or rabbinic authority.<sup>2</sup> As for the Festival of the Wavesheaf, debate remains as to whether the grain crop is lifted by the day itself, or by the ritual prescribed for it.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, it is probably because of the destruction of the temple that the expression "Day of Atonement" has been read as a genitive of effect ("the day that atones") rather than a temporal genitive ("the day when atonement is made").<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Irving Greenberg, The Jewish Way: Living the Holidays (New York: Summit Books, 1988), 415. However, Greenberg does notice a revival of New Moon observance among some Jewish feminists beginning in the mid-1970s. Ibid., 416. See also Arlene Agus, "This Month Is for You: Observing Rosh Hodesh as a Women's Holiday," in The Jewish Woman: New Perspectives, ed. Elizabeth Koltun (New York: Schocken Books, 1976), 84-93; Penina V. Adelman, "The Golden Calf Jumps over the New Moon: Mythmaking among Jewish Women," Anima 16 (1989): 31-39.

<sup>2</sup>The former position is defended by b. Pesahim 120a against Rabbi Ahi ben Jacob, while the latter position has recently been defended by Bloch, 137-143. For more information, see below, p. 161, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>The former position is defended by b. Sukkah 41b, while the latter position is defended by Bloch, 114, 115. For more information, see below, p. 180.

<sup>4</sup>"The Sin-offering and the unconditional Guilt-offering effect atonement; death and the day of Atonement effect atonement if there is repentance." M. Yoma 8:8, in The Mishnah, trans. Herbert Danby (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 173. For more information see

Judaism has particularly discussed the question of who should observe the weekly Sabbath. B. Sanhedrin 58b and Deut. Rab. 1:21 forbid non-Jews to observe the Sabbath under penalty of death.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Gen. Rab. 11:5 argues that if the Gentiles do not keep the Sabbath here, they will be forced to do so as they suffer in the afterlife.<sup>2</sup> Jubilees has the seeds of this universalism inherent in its claim that the Sabbath is first observed by God and the angels at creation (Jub 2:16-20), but then it restricts the observance of the Sabbath on earth to Israel (Jub 2:20-22, 30-33).<sup>3</sup> Philo has an extremely universal view of the Sabbath:

Now when the whole world had been brought to completion in accordance with the properties of six, a perfect number, the Father invested with dignity the seventh day which comes next, extolling it and pronouncing it holy; for it is the festival, not of a single city or country, but of the universe, and it alone strictly deserves to be called "public" as belonging to all people and the birthday of the world.<sup>4</sup>

---

George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927; reprint, 1962), 1:502. On the different species of the Hebrew genitive, see Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 143-154.

<sup>1</sup>See also Exod. Rab. 25:11; Johnston, 96, 97.

<sup>2</sup>Johnston, 100.

<sup>3</sup>This apocalyptic tradition continues in the Rabbinic Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer 18-20; Pesikta Rabbati 26.3, 9. See also Johnston, 98-101.

<sup>4</sup>Philo "On the Account of the World's Creation Given by Moses" 89 (trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, . Loeb Classical Library, Philo, I:73). See also Johnston,

In modern Judaism, the universality of the Sabbath is emphasized by Hermann Cohen,<sup>1</sup> Leo Baeck,<sup>2</sup> Martin Buber,<sup>3</sup> and Abraham J. Heschel.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, its particularism is emphasized by Abraham P. Bloch,<sup>5</sup> Samuel A.

---

99.

<sup>1</sup>Cohen believes that the Sabbath is a powerful expression of social morality, teaching the equality of all people. E.g., see Hermann Cohen, Reason and Hope: Selections from the Jewish Writings of Hermann Cohen, trans. Eva Jospe (New York: Norton, 1971; reprint, Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press, 1993), 116, 117. For Cohen, the Sabbath is initially given to Israel rather than to humanity as a whole. Nevertheless, "the Sabbath has conquered the world" (ibid., 87), and "even if the Jewish religion had no other merits, its institution and preservation of the Sabbath law alone would have added a new dimension to the progress of religion as such" (ibid., 225). For more information on this reference and those that follow, see Roy Branson, "Sabbath--Heart of Jewish Unity," JES 15 (1978): 722-732.

<sup>2</sup>Baeck considers the Sabbath to be a major Jewish contribution to humanity, and like Cohen notes its universal messianic dimensions. See Leo Baeck, "Mystery and Commandment," in Contemporary Jewish Thought, ed. Simon Noveck (New York: B'nai B'rith, 1963), 202; idem, This People Israel: The Meaning of Jewish Existence, trans. Albert H. Friedlander (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1964), 138.

<sup>3</sup>For Buber, the Sabbath began at creation and belongs to all people. See Martin Buber, Moses, The East and West Library (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1946), 84, 85.

<sup>4</sup>The universality of the Sabbath in Heschel's thinking is especially evident in the very title of Abraham J. Heschel, The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1951). "Was there ever a rebbe more daring? More than any thinker since Emancipation, Heschel launched Judaism on the venture of pursuing its most obvious particularity to the point of universality." Branson, 735.

<sup>5</sup>Bloch, 1, 3.

Meier,<sup>1</sup> and Monford Harris.<sup>2</sup>

As for the Day of Atonement, it has been argued that the commandment to humble oneself in Lev 16:29a applies only to the Israelite. There is a consensus that the alien is prohibited from working in vs. 29b, but it has been suggested that this prohibition applies only because of the disruption that such work would bring to the Israelite community.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, Julius H. Greenstone has suggested that the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement "might profitably be accepted by all men," since they "are distinctly religious in nature and have neither a national nor an agricultural significance."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuel A. Meier, "The Sabbath and Purification Cycles," in The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Traditions, ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi et al. (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991), 10, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Monford Harris, Exodus and Exile: The Structure of the Jewish Holidays (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), 9.

<sup>3</sup>So Baruch A. Levine, Leviticus 1-16, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 109. See also The Commentary of Abraham Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch, vol. 3, Leviticus, trans. Jay F. Shachter (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1986), 85; Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 1055.

<sup>4</sup>Julius H. Greenstone, Jewish Feasts and Fasts (New York: Bloch Pub. Co., 1946), 3. Significantly, Greenstone's reasoning is the opposite of that used by Thierry Maertens, O.S.B., A Feast in Honour of Yahweh: A Study in the Meaning of Worship, trans. Mother Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), 230, who claims that a feast cannot become universal if it belongs to a strictly astronomical cycle and cannot be related to an historical event.

As for the Feast of Booths, Midr. Ps. 109:4 illustrates a universalistic trend in its claim that at the Feast of Booths seventy bullocks are offered for the seventy nations, so that they might each have rain. On the other hand, Midr. Ps. 17:5 illustrates a particularistic trend in its claim that at the Feast of Booths it is revealed that the Israelites have been vindicated in the judgment rather than the Gentiles.<sup>1</sup>

### Christian Sources

In Christian circles the question of the present applicability of the Sabbath continues to be vigorously debated.<sup>2</sup> This question is often addressed largely from

---

<sup>1</sup>Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899), 2:765, claims that according to Midr. Ps. 31:1, three ordinances will be binding upon the Gentiles in the Messianic Age, one of which involves the observance of the Feast of Booths. See also Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 77. However, while Midr. Ps. 31:1 quotes Zech 14:12, it simply does not address the issue of any future Gentile observance of the feast. Pesikta de Rab Kahana 28:9 pictures Israel as praying for the other nations during the seven days proper of the Festival of Booths, but preserves "the eighth day" exclusively for the Holy One and Israel.

<sup>2</sup>Schreiner, 65, argues that "the difficulty in broadly distinguishing between moral and ritual law is over-rated." However, he concedes that the "Sabbath, of course, is one of the most difficult cases. Careful scholars disagree on the Pauline and theological significance of the Sabbath." Ibid., 74, n. 81. David Wenham, 96, n. 22, defends the division between moral and ceremonial law at length, but specifically acknowledges that he has not answered the question of how the Sabbath fits in with his model.

the perspective of New Testament studies.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, attention has also sometimes been given to the issue of Old Testament indicators of the extent of its applicability. Opponents of Christian Sabbath-keeping usually contend that there is no reference in the canon to Sabbath-keeping before Exod 16.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, supporters of Christian Sabbath-keeping have sometimes claimed that there are a number of implicit references to its observance earlier in the canon,<sup>3</sup> and have especially argued that the

---

<sup>1</sup>After noting the difficulty in classifying the Sabbath in terms of either moral or ritual law, Schreiner, 74, n. 81, concludes that "it is best characterized as part of the ritual law," solely on the basis of the New Testament passage, Col 2:16, 17.

<sup>2</sup>The nonobservance of the Sabbath by the Patriarchs is used as an argument against its continued applicability by Justin Martyr Dialogue with Trypho 19 (ANF, 1:204); Irenaeus Against Heresies 4.16.2 (ANF, 1: 480, 481); and Tertullian An Answer to the Jews 2.3 (ANF, 3:152, 153). For more information, see Johnston, 94, 95. Roger Douglass Congdon, "Sabbatic Theology" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1949), 122, 123, argues the same way, as does Richard James Griffith, "The Eschatological Significance of the Sabbath" (Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1990), 16-52.

<sup>3</sup>Bacchiocchi, 35, 36, notes that a period of seven days is mentioned in Gen 7:4, 10; 8:10, 12; 29:27; 50:10; Exod 7:25; 12:5, 16, 19; 13:6, 7. A direct reference to Sabbath-keeping is seen in Exod 5:5 by George Yamashiro, "A Study of the Hebrew Word Sabbath in Biblical and Talmudic Literatures" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1955), 11. James B. Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar: A Syllabus (Niceville, FL: Biblical Horizons, 1988), 83, 84, finds indications of Sabbath observance in Gen 7, 8, using the luni-solar calendar of orthodox Judaism.

These passages are not subsequently cited in discussion of the weekly Sabbath in this dissertation, because the Sabbath is not actually implicit in any of them. While "the Old Testament and other Near Eastern literature (including the Ugaritic) offer many



Old Testament pictures the Sabbath as a creation ordinance endowed with universal significance.<sup>1</sup> The universal

---

illustrations of occasional seven-day periods, . . . none of them demonstrates the existence of a seven-day week (i.e., a continual seven-day period)," and thus "they are of little value for the Sabbath question." Niels-Erik Andreassen, The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation, SBLDS, no. 7 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 113, 114.

The clause **והשבתם אתם מנסבלתם** in Exod 5:5 is translated in the KJV, "and ye make them rest from their burdens." However, in the Old Testament the Hiphil of **שבת** is consistently used with the preposition **מן** as an idiom for removing or keeping something or someone away from some other person, place, or object. E.g., see Exod 12:15; Lev 2:13; 26:6; Deut 32:26; 2 Kgs 23:11; Ps 89:44 (vs. 45, Hebrew); Isa 30:11; Jer 7:34; 16:9; 36:29; 48:33; Ezek 16:41; 23:27, 48; 30:13; 34:10, 25; Wigram, 1234, 1235; Gnana Robinson, "The Idea of Rest in the Old Testament and the Search for the Basic Character of Sabbath," ZAW 92 (1980): 39. Furthermore, the verb **והשבתם** is more likely to be a perfect consecutive rather than a perfect conjunctive, and is probably an interrogative rather than an affirmative statement. See Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautsch, trans. A. E. Cowley, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910; reprint New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 335. Accordingly, the clause **והשבתם אתם מנסבלתם** should probably be, "So would you keep them away from their labors?" This would not be a reference to the weekly Sabbath, but would instead be a rhetorical response to the request of Exod 5:2, 3, that the people be permitted to go to the wilderness for a three-day festal celebration.

The subjectivity of Jordan's reading of the flood story is illustrated by the fact that Wenham has read it in the light of the solar calendar of Jubilees, and has come to the same conclusion. G. J. Wenham, Genesis 1-15, WBC, vol. 1 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 180, 181. Wenham is correct when he himself admits that this hypothesis is "somewhat fragile" (ibid., 181), and that "these dates could all be a matter of coincidence." Idem, "Method in Pentateuchal Source Criticism," VT 41 (1991): 102.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Seventh-day Sabbatarian Anabaptist, Oswald Glait, and first-day Puritan Sabbatarian, Nicholas Bownd. See Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum, vol. 4, Letters and Treatises of Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig: December 1530-1533, ed. C. D. Hartranft and E. E. Johnson (Norristown, PA:

applicability of the Sabbath is sometimes argued on the basis of its inclusion in the Decalogue,<sup>1</sup> while at other

---

The Schwenckfelder Church and the Hartford Theological Seminary, 1914), 458, 491; Nicholas Bownd, The Doctrine of the Sabbath, Plainly Layed Forth, and Soundly Proved by Testimonies Both of Holy Scripture, and Also of Olde and New Ecclesiastical Writers (London: n.p., 1595), 5, 6. For more information, see Kenneth A. Strand, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Reformation Era," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 221; Gerhard F. Hasel, "Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century: Part I," AUSS 5 (1967): 119; Walter B. Douglas, "The Sabbath in Puritanism," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 231, 235. For examples of the use of this argument in the 17th century and 18th century seventh-day Sabbatarian movement in Britain, see Bryan W. Ball, The Seventh-day Men: Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales, 1600-1800 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 69, 75, 76, 86, 91, 92, 115, 116, 131, 162. More recent examples of an appeal to the creation origin of the weekly Sabbath include Yamashiro, 6, 7, 9; Bacchiocchi, 32-42; Ford, 75-85; Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 16; Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 22-26.

<sup>1</sup>In the context of first-day Sabbatarianism, Daniel Augsburger, "The Sabbath and the Lord's Day during the Middle Ages," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 198, notes the "connection between Sundaykeeping and the Decalogue rest . . . clearly established at the Second Council of Macon in 585." He then adds that during the Middle Ages "the appeal to the Sabbath commandment of the Decalogue became more and more definite," citing the Laws of the Alemanni (725), and noting that "in the Bavarian Laws the proper way of keeping the first day of the week was, for the first time perhaps, derived directly from the Decalogue." *Ibid.*, 199.

In the context of seventh-day Sabbatarianism, the unity of the Decalogue appears to be the chief argument of the Anabaptists Oswald Glait and Andreas Fischer. E.g., see Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum, 479; Hasel, "Sabbatarian Anabaptists: Part I," 118; *idem*, "Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century: Part II," AUSS 6 (1968): 27, 28. For 17th-century and 18th-century British examples of the

times it is rejected on exactly the same basis.<sup>1</sup> Isa 1:13 and Hos 2:11 are sometimes interpreted as predicting the end of Sabbath-keeping.<sup>2</sup> However, no systematic study appears to have been given to searching out and evaluating the indicators of its applicability throughout the Old Testament as a whole.

As for the other Pentateuchal sacred times, it seems that the Spring festivals have been at least partly absorbed into the Christian liturgical calendar, albeit with some adaptation. Accordingly, Passover has been partly taken over under the guise of Good Friday, the Feast of Unleavened Bread under the guise of Easter, and the Feast of Weeks under the guise of Pentecost.<sup>3</sup> The Lord's Supper has all the appearances of being a Christian permutation of Passover, whether it is celebrated annually or more often,<sup>4</sup> and it has been proposed that traces of the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Booths continue in the Christian Feast of Transfiguration and Feast of Church

---

use of this argument see Ball, 13, 43, 62, 63, 65, 69, 71-75, 80-82, 85, 86, 88, 91, 92, 147, 162. Twentieth-century examples include Yamashiro, 12, 13; Ford, 186-195.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Griffith, 59, 60.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Barnabas, chap. 15, on Isa 1:13; Griffith, 139-143; Congdon, 329, on Hos 2:11.

<sup>3</sup>Wenham, Leviticus, 306.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., see Robert M. Johnston, "Jewish Roots of the Lord's Supper," Shabbat Shalom, December 1994, 15, 16.

Dedication.<sup>1</sup> It has been argued that Revelation is designed as a lectionary of fifty Saturday night readings,<sup>2</sup> that John probably "still observed the outline of the Jewish festal year,"<sup>3</sup> and that on the basis of this division, Revelation contains "plausible readings for all the main Jewish(-Christian) feasts and high days . . . at the right intervals."<sup>4</sup> However, no systematic study appears to have been given to searching out and evaluating Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of any of these other times, let alone to comparing and contrasting such indicators with those for the weekly Sabbath.

In Roman Catholic scholarship, Maertens's study of the feast days is a significant exception. Maertens traces the alleged "evolution of the feasts of biblical religion" from their pagan roots,<sup>5</sup> arguing that while "all our Christian rites are derived from natural rites," only those that "belong to a nomadic culture or . . . [that can] be integrated in terms of a nomadic culture" can have

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see J. van Goudoever, Biblical Calendars, 2d rev. ed. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), 206-214.

<sup>2</sup>M. D. Goulder, "The Apocalypse as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies," NTS 27 (1981): 350-354.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 355.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. For supporting evidence, see *ibid.*, 355-360.

<sup>5</sup>Maertens, 6.

continuing relevance.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, "a whole series of feasts will be suppressed: all those that belong to an astronomical cycle . . . that cannot be related to an event."<sup>2</sup>

Maertens's ultimate test for the continued applicability of any particular feast is its alleged relationship to Sunday,

for when Christ appeared to the apostles on a Sunday, it was no longer man who chose the day for worship. It was the Father—and the Son who manifested Himself on that day—who made this choice. . . . So we see that it was necessary to be strictly selective and to accept only those feasts that could be related to this divine manifestation.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, "if the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost both became part of the Christian liturgy, it is only insofar as they are related to Sunday."<sup>4</sup>

Maertens is to be commended for attempting a biblical theology of the feasts. However, his claim that the Sabbath had its roots in the unlucky days of Sumer and Babylon does not stand up to close scrutiny.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, it is clear that Sunday did have special significance in

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 230.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 233.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 242.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 244. Maertens includes the offering of the Wavesheaf as a part of Passover, and has it offered on the first day of the week, as did the Sadducees. Ibid., 141-143.

<sup>5</sup>Andreasen, 1-8, in contrast to Maertens, 153.

the paganism of the early Christian era.<sup>1</sup> He does not take into account the fact that relating a feast day to an historical event may be associated with a limitation to its applicability.<sup>2</sup> Nor does he consider that historicization sometimes strengthens rather than weakens a feast's link to its agricultural roots.<sup>3</sup> Maertens's work also lacks thorough exegesis of the relevant Old Testament passages.

In Protestant scholarship, Jordan laments the fact that "the church has tended either to magnify the year to the exclusion of the sabbatical week, or (as in Puritanism) to isolate the week to the exclusion of months and years."<sup>4</sup> Instead, he believes that the church should take the weekly, monthly, and annual dimensions of the calendar seriously, along with the Sabbatical Year.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, he argues from Gen 1:14 that the annual festivals are just

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuele Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), 236-269, in contrast to Maertens, 242.

<sup>2</sup>For example, because the booths erected for the Feast of Booths specifically commemorate the wilderness experience of the Israelites, Lev 23:39-43 requires only native-born Israelites to live in them.

<sup>3</sup>For example, the historical confessions in Deut 26:1-11 presuppose settlement in the promised land and the reaping of its harvest.

<sup>4</sup>Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 73.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 4, 57, 72, 73.

as much a creation ordinance as the weekly Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> He also contends that the observance of a seventh-month harvest festival may be implicit in Gen 4:3,<sup>2</sup> that the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread is implicit in Gen 19:3,<sup>3</sup> and that Abraham's observance of all the different sacred times is implicit in Gen 26:5.<sup>4</sup>

Jordan contends that there are three points of contrast between date-keeping in Old Testament and New Testament times:

First of all, it is clear that the Old Covenant feast days, including the sabbath, are no longer to be regarded as times of blood-sacrifice. This is the most likely meaning of Col. 2:16,17. . . . Second, it is clear that to observe days with an attitude that God will be furious if we do not is no longer correct. . . . If we do [observe a day] . . . we must not think that our salvation depends on it, or even that it is a sin to neglect the special day. . . . Third, it is clear that the enforcement of day-keeping in the New Covenant is at the level of the conscience. Neither the state nor the church is to attempt to enforce or to require the observance of special days. "Let no man judge you" regarding these things.<sup>5</sup>

Jordan then argues that while the Old Covenant patterns remain, "under the New Covenant, redeemed man is, in

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 78-81.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 82, 83.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 87, 88.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 79.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 18, 19.

Christ, lord of history, and has been given flexibility in applying his life to God's patterns."<sup>1</sup>

Jordan is to be commended for attempting a biblical theology of the calendar. Some of his claims are valid.<sup>2</sup> Others may be mistaken, but clearly involve difficult issues.<sup>3</sup> However, some of his claims are either

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 19, 20.

<sup>2</sup>Jordan's claim that Col 2:16, 17 most likely addresses the question of blood-sacrifice on "the Old Covenant feast days, including the sabbath" (ibid., 18) closely parallels the position taken in this dissertation. See below, pp. 355, 356. Likewise, in answer to the Puritan concern that "other days would compete with, rather than fill out, the observance of the Lord's Day," he rightly notes that "the 'extra' sabbaths and festivals of the Old Covenant . . . did not detract from the weekly sabbath." Ibid., 96, 97.

<sup>3</sup>For example, his argument that Gen 1:14 refers to the institution of the annual festivals has wide scholarly support, although it is demonstrably wrong. See below, pp. 85-90.

In support of Jordan's interpretation of Gen 26:5 (ibid., 79), Westermann argues that Gen 26:5 teaches that Abraham observed the whole Mosaic Law, although in contrast to Jordan he dismisses it as an historically inaccurate Deuteronomic redaction. See Claus Westermann, Genesis 12-36, trans. John J. Scullion, Jr. (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Pub. House, 1985), 424, 425. In Gen 26:5, Yahweh reportedly explains to Issac that he promises to bless him "because Abraham listened to my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (עַקֵּב אֲשֶׁר-שָׁמַע (אֲבִרָהָם בְּקִלִּי וַיִּשְׁמַר מִשְׁמֵרָתִי מִצְוֹתַי חֻקֹּתַי וְתוֹרֹתַי). This verse does affirm the existence of divine law before Moses. Kaiser, "God's Promise Plan," 300. However, law in the Pentateuch is not pictured as a fixed body of revelation, but as something that is continually in the process of being revealed and reapplied over time. For example, "a statue and a judgment" (חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט) are given in Exod 15:25, and divine law (תּוֹרָה) is pictured as already existing in Exod 16:4, 28. However, these claims clearly do not preclude the revelation of further statutes and laws later in the narrative (e.g., in Exod 18:16-20). Likewise, Deut 18:15-



inconsistent,<sup>1</sup> based on distinctions of dubious merit,<sup>2</sup>

---

18 makes provision for the ongoing revelation of law after the time of Moses. Accordingly, Gen 26:5 may simply imply Abraham's submission to the totality of the divine instruction given to him in his own time and context, rather than his obedience to every detail of the Mosaic Law per se.

<sup>1</sup>Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 18, claims that the most likely meaning of Col 2:16-17 is the abrogation of the Old Covenant feast days as times of blood-sacrifice. However, without any further explanation, he then applies the language of Col 2:16, "Let no man judge you," to the separate issue of state or ecclesiastical enforcement of the days themselves. Ibid., 19. Jordan is also inconsistent on this subject of state and ecclesiastical enforcement, for he elsewhere claims that "the overseers of the Church must establish set times in the interests of decency and order. God backs them in this, and the individual Christian may not defy this ordering of time without defying God. . . . It will be up to civil officers to determine at what time the sabbath begins and ends . . . , and what kinds of shopping and activities are to be regarded as works of necessity or mercy." Ibid., 37.

Jordan's insistence that the validity of the whole calendar stands or falls together (ibid., 15, 65, 72, 73) is in tension with his admission that "the weekly sabbath worship has a degree of primacy . . . which is not present in seasonal festivals. The latter, I believe, may be regarded as optional. . . . My reason for holding this view is simply that the weekly sabbath occupies a central position in the sabbatical legislation of the Old Testament, and it is the weekly pattern which receives explicit mention in the New Testament (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2)." Ibid., 36.

<sup>2</sup>While Jordan sees the weekly Sabbath as a creation ordinance, he also argues that it was originally only meant to last until "the Old Probationary Covenant was finished." Ibid., 24. Then "on the final sabbath, God would pronounce all of mankind's faithfully performed works good, and man would receive the eschatological blessing of unlosable and eternal life. . . . This did not happen." Ibid. However, "Christ has already fulfilled the probation." Ibid., 27. Accordingly, Jordan argues that this typological dimension of the weekly Sabbath is no longer binding, although the "liturgical" and the "laborial" dimensions remain. Ibid., 35.

decidedly idiosyncratic,<sup>1</sup> overstated,<sup>2</sup> or simply untenable.<sup>3</sup> He also does not closely examine many of the

---

Although Jordan does not acknowledge the precedent, this distinction parallels Calvin's assertion that the typical function of the Sabbath in foreshadowing spiritual rest is now abolished in favor of more pragmatic considerations. See John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 2 vols., trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957), I:341, 343. However, there is no evidence that Genesis 2:1-3 itself attributes any typological function to the Creation Sabbath in a prefall context. See below, p. 109, n. 2.

The distinction between typological and non-typological aspects of the Sabbath seems to reflect the very dichotomy between nature and grace that Jordan himself elsewhere decries (e.g., *ibid.*, 79). He also does not explain how the alleged abrogation of this typological dimension of the Sabbath affects the actual observance of the Sabbath. However, it seems that it would hardly affect it at all, since he himself concedes that even in Eden, "man's works were to flow out of God's graciously given rest" (Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 42); that as individuals we remain on probation (*ibid.*, 27); and that "the weekly sabbath now points not only to the future final sabbath of history, but also points to the present continual sabbath enjoyed by Christ" (*ibid.*, 28).

<sup>1</sup>Jordan tentatively proposes "that if we keep the Lord's Day according to a creation-sabbath pattern, we should also keep it according to a new moon pattern: the first day of each lunar month." Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 76. However, he concedes that as far as he knows, "the Christian Church has never . . . ever observed new moons." *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup>The reference to Lot's preparation of unleavened bread in Gen 19:3 may be part of a narrative strategy to present his deliverance as a symbol of the Exodus. See Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 87, 88. However, it does not follow that Lot is pictured as actually observing the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Instead, from the perspective of Lot as a character, the preparation of unleavened bread may simply denote the haste with which he serves his guests.

<sup>3</sup>Jordan comments on Gen 4:3, that "the cutting off (gets) of days . . . was almost certainly at the end of the harvest. . . . The term *gets* . . . always indicates the cut-off point of some set period of time. . . . It is

Old Testament passages that may be helpful in indicating the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

Some seventh-day Sabbatarians teach that the annual sacred times of the Pentateuch should still be observed.<sup>1</sup> This position is sometimes argued exclusively from the New Testament,<sup>2</sup> although at other times alleged Old Testament

---

related phonetically to the words *qatsir* (harvest) and *qatsar* (to reap, cut down). . . . The harvest entails cutting down the fruit of the ground, and is the cutting off point for the agricultural year . . . Extrapolating backwards from information given at Sinai, we may readily imagine that Cain and Abel brought their sacrifices in the seventh month." Ibid., 82, 83. However, while the word קץ ("end") shares the idea of "cutting" with the noun קציר ("harvest") and the verb קצר ("to reap, cut down"), קץ with expressions of time refers to the cutting/ending of time and does not (without further information) refer to the cutting of grain which is involved in harvest. The use of the expression מִקֵּץ יָמִים ("at the end of days") elsewhere in the Old Testament certainly suggests that Genesis 4:3 simply envisages the end of an indefinite period of time. See 1 Kgs 17:7; Neh 13:6; and Jer 13:6, as listed by Wigram, 1113, 1114. See also Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, 2 vols., trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961-1964; reprint 1989-1992), 1:205.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., James L. Porter, The Sabbaths of God: The Meaning of God's Holy Days to Christians (New York: Exposition Press, 1966); Yisrayl Hawkins, The Sabbath: Every Question Answered (Abilene, TX: House of Yahweh, 1992); God's Festivals and Holy Days (n.p.: Worldwide Church of God, 1992); Luis Munilla, The Seven Feasts of the Lord and the Jubilee (Jemison, AL: By the author, 1990); Samuele Bacchiocchi, God's Festivals in Scripture and History, part 1, The Spring Festivals, Biblical Perspectives, no. 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1995).

<sup>2</sup>In response to a first draft of this dissertation, Bacchiocchi argues that "it is futile to look for internal indicators in the Old Testament texts to determine the

extent of the applicability of Israel's feasts to Christians today. . . . The criterion to determine the temporary or permanent nature of Old Testament feasts, such as Passover, is not the dates of their origins, pre-post-Mosaic, nor the degree of their association with the sacrificial system, but rather the extent to which their typology carries over with new meaning beyond the Cross." Bacchiocchi, Spring Festivals, 50, 51.

Bacchiocchi misunderstands the purpose of this study, which does not attempt to prejudge the New Testament evidence on the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times. Instead, it merely suggests the type of New Testament evidence either for or against continued applicability that might be forthcoming on the assumption of continuity between the Testaments. See below, p. 354.

While this dissertation does not attempt to prejudge the New Testament evidence, some of the serious flaws in the methodology Bacchiocchi applies to the New Testament should be noted. For example, he claims "that the continuity or discontinuity of the Feasts is determined not by their connection with the sacrificial system, but by the scope of their typology. If the Feasts had typified only the redemptive accomplishments of Christ's first Advent, then obviously their function would have terminated at the Cross. But, if the Feasts foreshadow also the consummation of redemption to be accomplished by Christ at His second Advent, then their function continues in the Christian church, though with a new meaning and manner of observance." Ibid., 13. However, Bacchiocchi's claim proves too much. He accepts that the New Testament exempts Gentiles from the law of circumcision (ibid., 86) and "that certain aspects of the law, such as those relating to the Levitical ministry and sacrifices, had become obsolete by the coming of Christ" (ibid., 87). However, these laws also have a typological scope pointing beyond the Cross. In Col 2:11 circumcision points to the "removal of the body of the flesh" (τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός), but this removal ultimately happens at the resurrection (1 Cor 15:35-57). Rev 6:9 uses the language of the sacrificial altar to speak of the martyred believers and their cry for vindication. Rev 15:7-16:17 uses the language of sacrificial bowls filled with blood to depict the seven last plagues.

Bacchiocchi (ibid.) also proves too much when he argues that "Paul kept the days of Unleavened Bread at Philippi (Acts 20:6) and was eager to be in Jerusalem 'on the day of Pentecost' (Acts 20:16)" but omits any reference to Paul's willingness to offer a sacrifice in Acts 21:26.

although at other times alleged Old Testament indicators of their continued applicability are cited in support.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, apologetic works against this position generally focus almost exclusively on the teaching of the New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary does speak of some apparent Old Testament indicators for a universal weekly Sabbath, then systematically contrasts them with apparent indicators for the limited applicability of the annual sacred times of the Pentateuch:

---

Bacchiocchi's evaluations of the individual criteria used in this dissertation to establish the permanence or impermanence of the Pentateuchal sacred times are critiqued below, pp. 58, n.2; 61, 336, n. 2; 63, n. 2.

<sup>1</sup>The Worldwide Church of God has argued that Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread "existed before the law of Moses," and "that originally there were no sacrifices—no meat and drink ordinances—held on these days. (See Jeremiah 7:22-23.) [sic] These days were not instituted for the purpose of the sacrifices as some have supposed." God's Festivals and Holy Days, 9. It has also been argued that they were commanded "forever" (ibid., 8, 28, 33, 44) and that in Zech 14:16 "we find a prophecy that the Feast of Tabernacles will be kept during the Millennium" (ibid., 43; see also ibid., 33, 34).

<sup>2</sup>Joseph Martin Hopkins, The Armstrong Empire: A Look at the Worldwide Church of God (n.p.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1974), 135-139. The same critique might be applied to apologetic works by seventh-day Sabbatarians. For example, Seventh-day Adventist authors, Harry W. Lowe, Radio Church of God: How Its Teachings Differ from Those of Seventh-day Adventists (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Pub. Assoc., 1970), 123, 124, and Holbrook, 6, both examine the use of עולם in connection with the annual sacred times of the Pentateuch. However, they do not address the issue of other possible Old Testament indicators of the extent of their applicability.

The Sabbath is different from all other feasts and holy convocations (see vs. 37, 38) in that it originated at creation (Gen. 2:1-3), whereas the annual feasts and "sabbaths" had their origin with the Jewish nation. The seventh-day Sabbath "was made for man" (Mark 2:27), and hence is of obligation for all men forever; the annual feasts were made for the Jews and ceased to be of obligation when type met Antitype at the death of Christ (Col. 2:16, 17). The seventh-day Sabbath is incorporated in the law of God, the Ten Commandments, His constitution for the world. Because it was made before sin entered, it will remain after sin is no more (Isa. 66:22, 23). On the other hand, the annual Jewish feasts were of only temporal, local, ceremonial application, fitted to conditions in Palestine, and could not be made of worldwide application.<sup>1</sup>

This analysis is deficient in many respects. Isa 66:22, 23 is quoted in support of Sabbath-keeping after the eradication of sin, but not in support of New Moon observance at that time. No attention is given to the seemingly universal observance of the Feast of Booths in Zech 14:16-19, nor is there any systematic analysis of the exact role of the promised land in the observance of the feasts. Finally, Old Testament laws cannot automatically be classified as temporal, local, and ceremonial, simply because they do not appear in the Decalogue.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 7 vols., ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1953-1957; rev. ed., 1976-1980), 1:802, hereafter abbreviated as SDABC, in its comments on Lev 23:3. "Because of its position in the substance of the 'Ten Commandments,' the weekly Sabbath retains its binding character on the recipient of the new covenant in a manner which does not apply to the sabbatical year or the year of jubilee." O. Palmer Robertson, The Christ of the Covenants (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), 74.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 31, 32.

### Research Methodology and Limitations

Despite the valuable contributions of many scholars, there is clearly a lack of detailed study of the Pentateuchal sacred times and of the Old Testament indicators of the extent of their applicability. The approach here adopted is that of a survey across the Old Testament in search of such indicators.

The main body of the dissertation consists of two chapters: chapter 2 considers indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times found in the Pentateuch itself, and chapter 3 considers indicators from elsewhere in the Old Testament. In both chapters, the general issue of ethical versus ritual law is addressed before the particular issue of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The term "ritual law" is used in this dissertation with reference to law governing the sacrificial system or the sanctuary cultus, particularly as it pertains to gaining access to the Deity. Notice how Roy Gane has recently defined an "individual ritual" as "a formulaic activity system carrying out an individual, complete cognitive task transformation process in which an 'inaccessible entity' unit is involved," or as "an activity system of which the components/subsystems are fixed in terms of their inclusion, nature, and relative order, and which carries out an individual, complete transformation process in which interaction with an entity or a group of entities ordinarily inaccessible to the material domain takes place." Roy E. Gane, "Ritual Dynamic Structure: Systems Theory and Ritual Syntax Applied to Selected Ancient Israelite, Babylonian and Hittite Festival Days" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1992), 71, emphasis his. See also idem, "Macrostructural Comparisons between Israelite, Babylonian, and Hittite Ritual Days of Sancta Purification" (Prepared for the SBL Annual Meetings, Chicago, IL, November, 1994), 2.

A preliminary examination has been undertaken of all the Old Testament passages referring to the Pentateuchal sacred times, and to the first, third, or seventh months, in which the annual sacred times are clustered. On the basis of the Old Testament passages referring to these sacred times, five possible criteria are here developed for establishing whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary.

The first and most direct criterion is the specific absence or presence of a stated terminus ad quem for the observance of a sacred time. The terms עולם ("perpetuity, eternity") and דורות ("generations") are used chronologically in a number of passages in connection with the Pentateuchal sacred times, and these passages have been cited as evidence of their permanence.<sup>1</sup> Four passages in the Prophets predict a prominent place for various Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory,<sup>2</sup> and these passages have also been used as evidence of the

---

The term "ethical law" in this dissertation is used for law governing conduct that is not classified as being "ritual."

<sup>1</sup>E.g., by God's Festivals and Holy Days, 8, 9, 28, 33, 34.

<sup>2</sup>Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; Zech 14:16-19.



permanence of one or more of them.<sup>1</sup> However, these passages need to be examined carefully in their context.

The second criterion concerns the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding the terminus a quo of a sacred time. If a sacred time is pictured as being instituted at creation, a *prima facie* case exists that it is a universal institution intended for all people. On the other hand, it cannot be presumed that a sacred time is temporary simply because it is pictured as originating in the wilderness period. However, if it is pictured as being established specifically to commemorate events in Israel's history, a *prima facie* case exists that the obligation to observe it is not universal.

The validity of this criterion has been challenged by some interpreters who accept that the canon pictures the Sabbath as a creation ordinance.<sup>2</sup> However, its

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., by God's Festivals and Holy Days, 33, 34, 43; SDABC, 1:802.

<sup>2</sup>Luther teaches that Adam observed the weekly Sabbath before and after the fall. Luther's Works, vol. 1, Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1-5, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1958), 79, 80. Nevertheless, he sometimes dismisses the Sabbath commandment as merely ceremonial. Luther's Works, vol. 40, 96-98. For more information see Strand, 216.

Merril F. Unger, "The Significance of the Sabbath," Bsac 123 (1966): 53-59, argues that the Sabbath is kept by Adam and Eve before the fall, but is suspended when the fall marred the perfect rest it symbolized, and in the time of Moses is reintroduced only for Israel. However, Unger's proposal lacks clear exegetical support, and ignores the use of creation themes as a model for human existence in Gen 8:20-9:7. It is thus rightly rejected by no less an antisabbatarian than Griffith, 51, n. 121.

significance is eloquently defended by William Paley, even though he believes that the canon pictures the Sabbath as being instituted only at the time of the Exodus:

If the Divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come

---

Bacchiocchi, Divine Rest, 32-42, accepts the validity of this criterion. However, he now disputes the relevance of this or any other Old Testament evidence to the issue of its universality. For example, in response to this dissertation he argues "that though the Sabbath is clearly linked to the socio-economic-religious life of the Israelites in the Old Testament, Christ clearly declares in the New Testament that 'The sabbath was made for man' (Mark 2:27), not merely for the Jews. Ultimately, it is the New Testament witness that determines the applicability to Christians of the Sabbath or any other Old Testament institution." Idem, Spring Festivals, 50. This study does not dispute the ultimate authority of the New Testament for Christians. However, Mark 2:27 does not present a de novo line of reasoning, but instead argues from the Old Testament picture of a creation Sabbath. As Bacchiocchi himself has commented: "Our Lord's choice of words is significant. The verb "made"—*ginomai* alludes to the original "making" of the Sabbath . . . and the word "man"—*anthropos* suggests its human function. Thus to establish the human and universal value of the Sabbath Christ reverts to its very origin, right after the creation of man. Why? Because for the Lord the law of the beginning stands supreme." Idem, Divine Rest, 41. Bacchiocchi draws a parallel with Matt 19:8 and its clarification of the value and function of marriage by an appeal to "the Edenic law." Ibid.

The relevance of this criterion is challenged by interpreters who reject the historicity of the Old Testament accounts of the origins of the sacred times. E.g., Kenneth Hein, "A Catholic Response to J. B. Doukhan," in The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Tradition, ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi et al. (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991), 169-175. However, this challenge is not valid when "the object of theological reflection is the canonical writing of the Old Testament" rather than "the events or experiences behind the text, or apart from the construal in scripture by a community of faith and practice." Brevard S. Childs, Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985), 6.

to the knowledge of it. If the command was published for the first time in the wilderness, then it was immediately directed to the Jewish people alone; and something further, either in the subject or circumstances of the command, will be necessary to show that it was designed for any other. . . . The former opinion precludes all debate about the extent of the obligation; the latter admits, and *prima facie* induces a belief that the Sabbath ought to be considered as part of the peculiar law of the Jewish policy.<sup>1</sup>

The second criterion is particularly related to the question of whether a sacred time is applicable to all people or whether it is instituted specifically for Israel. However, it is also related to the belief that unless explicitly stated otherwise, creation institutions remain a part of the divine ideal for humanity,<sup>2</sup> even if they do not always automatically apply in the postfall situation.<sup>3</sup>

The third criterion concerns the identity of those who observe a sacred time. Since the Old Testament is addressed in the first instance to Israel and/or Judah as

---

<sup>1</sup>William Paley, The Works of William Paley, complete in 1 volume, new ed. (Philadelphia, PA: Crissy and Markley, n.d.), 103.

<sup>2</sup>See John Murray, Collected Writings of John Murray, vol. 1, The Claims of Truth (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976), 206. This is especially the case if part of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch is to point to the restoration of the Edenic state as the ultimate purpose of Israel's election. See below, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>Accordingly, Gen 9:2 repeats the imperatives of Gen 1:28, to be "fruitful and multiply and fill the earth," yet omits the accompanying command to "subdue the earth," presumably because for the time being it has proved too difficult to implement. See Laurence A. Turner, Announcements of Plot in Genesis, JSOTSS, no. 96 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1990), 33-41.

the covenant people of God, there should be ample evidence of their being required to observe the Pentateuchal sacred times. Accordingly, what is of significance for this study is the presence of indications of how non-Israelites are to relate to the observance of a sacred time.<sup>1</sup> A sacred time that an uncircumcised alien is required to keep would presumably be of more universal significance than a sacred time he is simply permitted to keep, and certainly of more universal significance than a sacred time he is prohibited from observing.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>On the importance of not separating the "question of claim . . . from the question of authority . . . too quickly without observing all the factors involved," see Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Toward Old Testament Ethics (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books from Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 310, 311.

<sup>2</sup>Bacchiocchi invokes this criterion in his discussion of the Jerusalem Council: "The exemption from circumcision granted to the Gentiles is [generally] interpreted as representing the abandonment of the rest of the Old Testament laws, including Holy Days. The interpretation is inaccurate because the council's final court of appeal is Moses himself . . . (Acts 15:21). . . . How could the Council have rejected the authority of Moses when its decree that the Gentiles must observe four ritual laws (Acts 15:20, 29) is based upon the Mosaic legislation regarding the stranger living with the Israelites (Lev 17-18)?" Bacchiocchi, Spring Festivals, 86, 87. However, he specifically rejects the use of this criterion in the present dissertation: "The problem with this reasoning is that it assumes that the indicators found, for example, in the various Old Testament Passover accounts determine the extent of the applicability of the feast for the rest of redemptive history. This is the literalistic method of interpretation used by Dispensationalists today. They read the Old Testament as if Christ had never come and as if the New Testament had never been written. For example, they interpret God's promise to Abraham that his descendants would inherit 'all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession' (Gen 17:8; cf. 12:7; 13:15) as an indicator of

The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time. If the obligation to observe a sacred time is pictured as depending either on the functioning of the sacrificial cultus or on a specific geographical location or

---

the limitation of God's territorial promise to Jews. On the basis of this internal indicator, they conclude that the fulfillment of such promise began for the first time in 1948 with the dramatic recovery of part of Palestine by the Jews.

"Such a literalistic interpretation of the Old Testament ignores the witness of the New Testament where territorial promises made to Abraham are fulfilled, not through a repossession of Palestine by the Jews, but through the inheritance of the *whole renewed earth* by believers of all nations (Rom 4:13; Matt 5:5; Rev 21:1-8). The land of Canaan becomes the world and the offspring of Abraham become all the believers who live by faith like Abraham (Gal 3:17, 28-29)." Ibid., 49.

In fact, Bacchiocchi's method is the one that is literalistic. He asks, "How can Passover be celebrated spiritually as a memorial of our deliverance from the bondage of sin through Christ, our paschal Lamb, while its literal observance is rejected?" Ibid., 112. However, the New Testament repudiates such literalism when it spiritualizes circumcision for uncircumcised Gentiles (Rom 2:28, 29).

It is accepted in this dissertation that the Lord's Supper may be a permutation of Passover. See above, p. 44. What is not accepted is the claim that Old Testament laws restricted to those who are circumcised are now literally incumbent upon Christians simply because of their typological scope. See the response to *ibid.*, 13, given above, p. 52, n. 2. In particular, typological scope is not an adequate basis for insisting on the annual observance of the Lord's Supper at Passover time. Instead, it is insisted in this dissertation that in a biblical theology emphasizing continuity between the Testaments, a specific New Testament reenactment for Gentiles would be expected of those elements of legislation specifically applying only to Israel in the Old Testament. See below, p. 354.

Bacchiocchi also does not consider the possibility that the New Testament expansion of the promises made to Israel is not arbitrary, but arises out of the context of the Old Testament itself. See below, p. 374, n. 1.

circumstance, then the disappearance of the prerequisite element would constitute a natural statute of limitations to the extent of the sacred time's applicability.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, if the obligation to observe a sacred time is pictured as being independent of such factors, the obligation to observe would be expected to continue in their absence.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>On the priority of laws observed throughout the wilderness period over those that are not, see below, pp. 78-84, 276-276. On the temporary nature of the sacrificial cultus, see below, pp. 70-76, 243-263.

<sup>2</sup>Caution must be exercised in considering the question of whether a sacred time only applies in the land, that due consideration be given to the context in which particular expressions are used. For example, in Exod 12:20, the phrase **בכל משכין** ("in all your dwellings") is used with reference to the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In Lev 23, it is used with reference to the weekly Sabbath (vs. 3), the Festival of the Wavesheaf (vs. 14), the Feast of Weeks (vss. 17, 21), and the Day of Atonement (vs. 31). See Wigram, 675. van Houten, 137, 138, argues that in the case of Exod 12:20, it points to a law that is to be observed both inside and outside the land of Palestine. However, she herself concedes that in Num 35:29, the same phrase only applies to the promised land. Ibid., 138. Context must therefore determine whether a law applies outside the land, rather than the use of this phrase in and of itself.

The biblical "text was given primarily for the common people" and therefore its "message was relayed on a level where they would find it easiest to grasp. Had the truth been conveyed in abstract and theoretical axioms, the prerogative would have been confined to the elite and the scholarly." Kaiser, "How Can Christians Derive Principles from the Specific Commands of the Law?" 192. Accordingly, the fact that a law may contain timebound formulations is not an argument against the timelessness of the law per se. As noted by Bacchiocchi, Spring Festivals, 50, the various Sabbath texts contain culture-specific references "to the manservant, maidservant, cattle, sojourner, plowing time, harvest time, covenant, and sacrifices (Ex 20:10; 23:12; 34:21; 31:13-14; Num 28:9-10 [sic; should be 28:9, 10]).

In terms of the fourth criterion, three passages prescribe the death penalty for Sabbath-breaking (Exod 31:14; 35:2; Num 15:32-35). It has been argued that since Sabbatarians today do not enforce this penalty, the Sabbath commandment has been abrogated.<sup>1</sup> However,

the law explicitly states that capital punishment for various offenses is not part of an eternal law. Cain's blood was not shed in *lex talionis* for Abel's blood,

---

However, the timebound nature of these references is not a convincing argument against the perpetuity of the Sabbath itself." Ibid.

In the light of this fact, Bacchiocchi dismisses the suggestion of this study that the sanctuary rituals performed on the holy days be examined as a clue to the extent of their applicability. Ibid., 13, 51, against idem, The Sabbath in the New Testament: Answers to Questions, Biblical Perspectives, no. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1985), 196, 197. However, he does not see that what is important for this investigation is not the presence of such references, but the relationship the referents have to the observance of the sacred time as a whole. For example, if the specific reason for observing the weekly Sabbath is to facilitate the offering of sacrifice, then the end of the sacrificial system would constitute a natural limitation to its applicability, and a specific reinstatement of the obligation to observe it would be expected for it to survive the collapse of the system. On the other hand, if Sabbath sacrifices are an expression of the prior sanctity of the Sabbath, then the end of the sacrificial system would not constitute a natural limitation to its applicability, and a specific revocation of the obligation to observe it would be expected for it to end with the system. The question is thus whether the sacrifices are for the day, or whether the day is for the sacrifices.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Griffith, 87: "Finally, the punishment of death associated with the Sabbath also indicates its temporal nature, for those who advocate its permanence today would hardly enforce this scriptural penalty upon Sabbathbreakers." However, capital punishment for contemporary Sabbath-breaking is advocated by Greg L. Bahnsen, Theonomy in Christian Ethics, 2d ed. (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1984), 445, 446.

which cried out for justice, but in fact was protected (Ge 4:15). Capital punishment for religious offenses is specifically denied an unrestricted status with respect to the time and place of the offense and the people involved in it. When the son of Shelomith blasphemed, the people were confused as to what to do, showing that capital punishment for that crime did not exist before Israel became a nation. Only after they had put him in custody did the Lord make his will known to the people (Lev 24:10-16).<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, nobody would deny the continued validity of the prohibitions against murder and cursing the divine name. The absence of capital punishment for Sabbath-breaking is likewise not a convincing argument against the perpetuity of the Sabbath.<sup>2</sup> In particular, the death penalty for breaking religious laws may have been "appropriate for Israel's unique situation" as a theocracy, but it is "not appropriate in a pluralistic society."<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, variation in the penalties for not observing a sacred time is not an indicator of whether the sacred time is permanent or temporary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Waltke, 84, 85.

<sup>2</sup>The flexibility in the Old Testament application of penalties is also noted by Longman, 52: "A clear example of such flexibility is in the law of the goring ox (Ex 21:28-32). According to this law, if an ox gores and kills a second time after a warning, the owner is to be put to death. However, there is the possibility that he can pay a ransom if it is demanded of him. Thus this law at least is flexible. . . . Here we have a law that envisions two possible penalties of vastly different levels of severity. The flexibility of this law plus an examination of other penalties in the Old Testament lead me to believe that the *ius talionis* (Ex 21:23-24) is setting a limit to the severity of the punishment allowed, not mandating in every case the maximum allowed."

<sup>3</sup>Waltke, 85.



The fifth criterion concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times. If the observance of a given sacred time is dependent upon the applicability of another sacred time, then when the second sacred time no longer applies, the dependent sacred time will also no longer apply. On the other hand, if the observance of a given sacred time does not presuppose the applicability of any other sacred time, it must be evaluated purely on its own terms.

The approach adopted here is a topical one, in which the exegesis undertaken is thorough with regard to the elements relevant to this study, but not exhaustive in other respects. This exegesis will include the basic procedures of exegetical methodology as required, namely, textual study and translation, study of the historical context, literary analysis, word study, and grammatical-syntactical analysis. At the same time, this approach is a theological one, with a focus on the final form of the text.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This approach accordingly has some affinities with that of Childs. However, even outside the circle of Childs's canonical theology, there has been an increasing realization that the biblical text must ultimately be understood in terms of its final composition. E.g., see Pierre Gibert, "Vers une intelligence nouvelle du Pentateuque?" Revue des sciences religieuses 80 (1992): 55-80.

Summary

Despite the valuable contributions of numerous scholars, there is a lack of adequate detailed study of Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament laws in general. This lacuna is unfortunate, for this topic is directly related to whether the law is a point of continuity or discontinuity between the Testaments, a question that in turn may have implications for Jewish-Christian dialogue, as well as for biblical theology in general and for Old Testament theology in particular. It is this lacuna that this dissertation partially seeks to fill, with particular reference to Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

The question of the extent of the applicability of the weekly Sabbath has been vigorously debated by both Jews and Christians, ancient and modern, and in these debates some attention has been given to the issue of Old Testament indicators of the extent of its applicability. However, no systematic study appears to have been given to searching out and evaluating indicators of the extent of its applicability throughout the Old Testament as a whole.

Despite the efforts of Maertens, Jordan, and some seventh-day Sabbatarians, little attention has been given to finding Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of the other Pentateuchal sacred times, let

alone to systematically comparing and contrasting such indicators with those for the weekly Sabbath.

The approach adopted here is that of a survey across the Old Testament in search of possible indicators of the extent of the applicability of these sacred times. The main body of the dissertation consists of two chapters: chapter 2 considers indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times found in the Pentateuch itself, and chapter 3 considers such indicators as they occur elsewhere in the Old Testament. In both chapters, the general issue of ethical versus ritual law is addressed first, followed by the particular issue of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times. A preliminary examination has been undertaken of all the Old Testament passages referring to the Pentateuchal sacred times, and to the first, third, or seventh months in which the annual sacred times are clustered. From this examination five possible criteria have been developed to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: criteria that relate respectively to the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time; the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding its terminus a quo; the identity of those who observe it; the constituent elements necessary for its observance; and its interrelationship with other sacred times.

The exegesis undertaken is thorough, but not exhaustive, and is focused specifically on the elements relevant to this study. The theological emphasis is on the final form of the text.

## CHAPTER II

### THE EXTENT OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PENTATEUCHAL SACRED TIMES IN THE PENTATEUCH ITSELF

The survey of the Pentateuch undertaken in this chapter is divided into three main parts: the first addresses the issue of ethical versus ritual law, the second considers the Pentateuchal sacred times collectively, and the third considers the Pentateuchal sacred times individually.

#### Ethical versus Ritual Law

This part of the chapter is divided into two subsections, the first entitled "Vertical Sanctuary Typology" and the second entitled "The Place of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy."

#### Vertical Sanctuary Typology

The issue of ritual law in the Pentateuch especially centers around the sanctuary. Accordingly, Kaiser suggests that a temporal limitation of the tabernacle services is indicated by the use of the word

"pattern" (תבנית) in Exod 25:9, 40, where instructions are given concerning the construction of the sanctuary:<sup>1</sup>

ככל אשר אני מראה אותך את תבנית המשכן ואת תבנית כל־כליו וכן תעשו:  
 . . . וראה ועשה בתבניתם אשר־אתה מראה בהר

- 9 According to all that I am about to show you:<sup>2</sup> the pattern of the tabernacle and the pattern of all its utensils, so shall you make [them].<sup>3</sup> . . .  
 40 And see that you make [them] by their pattern<sup>4</sup> that you are about to be shown on the mountain.

R. M. Davidson has argued that the use of the word תבנית here "allows for and seems to lean toward the implication of a vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence."<sup>5</sup> As for the exact nature of this

---

<sup>1</sup>Kaiser, "God's Promise Plan," 289, quoted above, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX assimilates to its reading of the beginning of vs. 8 when it begins this clause with the phrase, **καὶ ποιήσεις μοι** ("and you shall make for me"). The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX, assimilates to Exod 25:40; 26:30; 27:8, by adding **בהר** ("on the mountain") at the end of the clause.

<sup>3</sup>The LXX clearly reads the singular **תעשה** instead of the plural **תעשו** when it finishes vs. 9 with the Greek singular **ποιήσεις**.

<sup>4</sup>Some Targum manuscripts and the LXX and the Vulgate clearly adopt the less difficult reading **כתבניתם** ("according to their pattern") instead of **בתבניתם** ("by their pattern"). The development of this alternate reading is readily understandable in view of the resemblance between the letters **ב** and **כ**.

<sup>5</sup>Richard M. Davidson, Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical **τύπος** Structures, AUSDDS, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 384. Syntactical analysis is the primary basis of Davidson's argument, although it "is supported by (1) the immediate

correspondence, "it seems probable that Moses was given a vision of the heavenly sanctuary and then provided with a miniature model of the heavenly as a pattern to copy in constructing the earthly."<sup>1</sup> Davidson concludes that

it does not seem possible to decide with certainty from the available evidence whether the primary reference of הכנייה is to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary, to the heavenly sanctuary itself (with a miniature model assumed), or to both. But whichever is primarily in view, both the heavenly sanctuary (Urbild) and miniature model (nachbildliches Vorbild) appear still to be ultimately bound up with the term.<sup>2</sup>

Two implications follow from Davidson's conclusion. First, since the earthly sanctuary and its rituals are an incomplete copy or shadow of a cosmic or heavenly reality, they point beyond themselves to a cosmic-scale enactment.<sup>3</sup> Second, the repetition of the earthly ritual cycle year after year without effecting permanent atonement implies that a cosmic-scale, effectual reality is forthcoming.<sup>4</sup>

---

theophanic context, combined with the stated function of the sanctuary as a dwelling-place for God; (2) ancient Near Eastern parallels; (3) OT [Old Testament] parallels; (4) apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical literature; (5) rabbinic sources; (6) the LXX translation; and (7) the interpretation of Philo." Ibid.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 385.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 386, 387.

<sup>3</sup>This implication is essentially the argument drawn from Exod 25:40 by Heb 8:1-5.

<sup>4</sup>This implication is essentially the argument of Heb 10:1-3.

The second implication is confirmed by a comparison of Gen 1-3 and Lev 16 in terms of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch as a whole.

Clines has argued that the theme of the Pentateuch is the "*partial fulfilment*" and "*the partial non-fulfilment . . . of the promise to . . . the patriarchs*," a promise that "has three elements: posterity, divine-human relationship, and land."<sup>1</sup> He also notes that the prefacing of the promise of Gen 12:1-3 with the primeval history of Gen 1-11 leads to the possibility of aligning this promise with the blessing of Gen 1:26-29, and concludes that "Genesis 12:3, however interpreted, envisages some kind of overspill of blessing beyond the Abrahamic family."<sup>2</sup> However, the juxtaposition of Gen 1-11 with the rest of the Pentateuch suggests more than an incidental "overspill" of the Abrahamic blessing. Instead, it suggests that the ultimate purpose of Israel's election is the restoration of humanity to the pristine state of Gen 1-2, and so the idea of a cosmic eschatology developed later in the canon may in fact be implicit from its introduction.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>David J. A. Clines, The Theme of the Pentateuch, JSOTSS, no. 10 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978), 29.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 78, 79.

<sup>3</sup>See W. A. Gage, The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology (Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter Books, 1984), and John H. Sailhamer, "Genesis," EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs.,



In this context, it should be noted that "the language of Genesis 1-2" points to "the Garden of Eden" as "the earthly counterpart of the heavenly sanctuary," with the three spheres of "the earth, the garden, and the 'midst of the garden'" corresponding to "the court, Holy Place, and the Most Holy Place in the sanctuary."<sup>1</sup> However, it should also be noted that access to these three different spheres varies from one situation to another.

In the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve are clearly described as living in the second sphere of holiness ("the garden") and having free access to the third sphere ("the midst of the garden"). However, after the Fall, human access is confined to the first sphere ("the earth outside the garden"). On the other hand, the Mosaic tabernacle is built so that Yahweh may tabernacle among his people (Exod 25:8). The daily access of the priests to the Holy Place and the annual access of the High Priest to the Most Holy Place each Day of Atonement certainly represent an advance on the situation after the Fall. However, there is still

---

1990), 2:23, who argues that the use of רֵאשִׁית ("beginning") in Gen 1:1 intentionally anticipates the coming אַחֲרִית ("end").

<sup>1</sup>Richard M. Davidson, "The Garden of Eden a Sanctuary?" (unpublished paper, 1996, Andrews University), 1, 2. See also William J. Dumbrell, The End of the Beginning (Homebush, New South Wales: Lancer Books, 1985), 35-76; G. J. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies 9 (1986): 19-25.

not the full and free access of the original creation. Instead, the ritual of the Mosaic tabernacle is only a temporary measure enacted until a priesthood is established offering full and permanent access to the divine presence.

The variability of access to the divine presence afforded by the sanctuary is further illustrated by a comparison of the relationship between God and Israel before and after her worship of the golden calf. The Levites are pictured as being chosen after the worship of the golden calf (Exod 32:26-28), and are elsewhere said to replace the firstborn of Israel (Num 3:12). It is thus implied that if it were not for this apostasy, the sacerdotal function of the Levites would instead have belonged to the firstborn of all the tribes.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, after the worship of the golden calf, "the original idea of a 'Tent of Meeting' by which God would dwell among his people . . . become[s] one of the means whereby God had been set apart from them."<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, the vertical sanctuary typology of Exod 25:9, 40 implies that the earthly sanctuary and its rituals point beyond themselves to a cosmic-scale enactment, and the repetition of the earthly ritual cycle

---

<sup>1</sup>See Sailhamer, Pentateuch, 313.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 314, contrasting Exod 27:21; 28:43; 29:42, 43, with Exod 33:7; 36:6-8. See also R. W. L. Morley, At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34, JSOTSS, no. 22 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 171-177; above, pp. 15-17.

year after year without effecting permanent atonement implies that a cosmic-scale, effectual reality is forthcoming. The second implication is confirmed by a comparison of Gen 1-3 and Lev 16 in terms of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch as a whole, which shows that the ritual of the Mosaic tabernacle is only a temporary measure enacted until a priesthood is established offering full and permanent access to the divine presence. This variability in the access to the divine presence afforded by the sanctuary is further illustrated by a comparison of the relationship between God and Israel before and after her worship of the golden calf.

#### The Place of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy

It has long been noted that the Decalogue in Deuteronomy has certain distinctive features vis-à-vis the other Pentateuchal legal formulations. One may not choose to speak in terms of "the moral law" and "the ceremonial law," as Doukhan does. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that he has provided a good summary of some of these distinctive features:

1. The Decalogue had been written by God (Deuteronomy 10:4), while the ceremonial law was outlined by Moses (Deuteronomy 31:9, 24).
2. The Decalogue was graven on tables of stone—an imperishable material (Deuteronomy 10:3), while the ceremonial law had been written in a book—a perishable material (Deuteronomy 31:24).
3. The Decalogue was entrusted by God to Moses, who himself placed it in the ark (Deuteronomy 10:5), while the ceremonial law was entrusted by Moses to the

priests, who, in turn, placed it alongside the ark  
[sic] (Deuteronomy 31:26).<sup>1</sup>

As for the legal terminology of Deuteronomy, the tripartition of the law into moral, ceremonial, and judicial law cannot be supported from the use of the legal terms "the commandment" (המצוה), "the statutes" (החקים), and "the judgments" (המשפטים) in Deut 6:1.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, Georg Braulik has shown that a study of legal terms used in Deuteronomy confirms that the Decalogue is presented as having a special status vis-à-vis the other laws in Deuteronomy, whether or not it is classified as "moral law." Thus Deuteronomy always uses the terms חקיה/חקים, משמרה ( "charge"), מצוה (singular), משפטים, and ערה ("testimonies") to refer to the contents of Deut 6-26, and never to the Decalogue of Deut 5.<sup>3</sup> Conversely, whenever it speaks of law as ברית ("covenant"),<sup>4</sup> Deuteronomy refers exclusively to the Decalogue.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Doukhan, 82, 83. See also Waltke, 72.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 20, 21.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., see Georg Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bib* 51 (1970): 53-56, 60, 61, 63, 64.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Deut 4:13; 5:2, 3; 9:9, 11, 15; 10:8; 17:2; 29:25 (vs. 24, Hebrew); 31:9, 16, 20, 25, 26; as opposed to Deut 29:1 (Deut 28:69, Hebrew); 29:9, 12, 14, 21 (vss. 8, 11, 13, 20, Hebrew).

<sup>5</sup>E.g., see Braulik, 43-45.

plural מצוות ("commandments") designates either the Decalogue of Deut 5,<sup>1</sup> or Moses' promulgation in Deut 6-26,<sup>2</sup> but never both at once.<sup>3</sup> However, whether or not this terminological distinction points to the permanence of the Decalogue vis-à-vis the rest of the Deuteronomic legislation is a separate issue.

Lohfink argues for the permanence of the Decalogue from the perspective of the literary structure of Deuteronomy. He notes that the expression חקים ומשפטים ("statutes and judgments") frames the whole of Deut 5:1-26:16, but that the actual topic of Deut 5:2-29 is the Decalogue, with the listing of statutes and judgments only beginning with the fresh heading of Deut 6:1. He also argues that Deut 6-11 is essentially an elaboration of the first commandment, and that in the later stages of traditio-historical development, the individual prescriptions of Deut 12-26 are increasingly arranged

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Deut 5:10, 29; 6:17; 7:9; 8:2; 13:5.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Deut 4:2, 40; 6:2; 8:6, 11; 10:13; 11:1, 13, 27, 28; 13:18 (vs. 19, Hebrew); 26:17, 18; 28:1, 9, 13, 15, 45; 30:8, 10, 16.

<sup>3</sup>See Braulik, 56-60. Terminological distinctions between the Decalogue and the other laws of Deuteronomy are less clear in the use of terms such as דברים/דבר, דרכים/דרך, and תורה. Ibid., 45-51, 64-66.

according to the order of the Ten Commandments.<sup>1</sup> The Decalogue is thus set apart as the fundamental statement of law elaborated in Deut 6-26.<sup>2</sup>

Lohfink argues convincingly that in contrast to the Decalogue, Deut 12-26 as a whole applies only temporarily, since the former applies in the Wilderness, but the latter comes into force only once Israel has entered the promised land.<sup>3</sup> He also makes a good case that this relativization

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 8; Georg Braulik, Die deuteronomischen Gesetze und der Dekalog: Studien zum Aufbau von Deuteronomium 12-26, Suttgarter Bibel-Studien, no. 145 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1991). Kaiser and Jordan see Deut 6-26 as being structured around each of the Ten Commandments, although without the traditio-historical perspective of Lohfink and Braulik. Kaiser, Toward Old Testament Ethics, 127-137; James B. Jordan, Covenant Sequence in Leviticus and Deuteronomy (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989), 59-67.

<sup>2</sup>Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 80; idem, "*huqqim ūmišpātīm*," 3.

On the ways that Pentateuchal legal codes outside of Deuteronomy expound on the Ten Commandments, see Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 82-85; John I. Durham, Exodus, WBC, vol. 3 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 318; John E. Hartley, Leviticus, WBC, vol. 4 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992), 309, 310. "What is the Mosaic case law but the application of the Ten Commandments to the nation of Israel?" Longman, 46.

<sup>3</sup>According to Deut 12:1, the statutes and judgments which follow are to be observed "in the land . . . all the days that you live upon the land" (בְּאֶרֶץ . . . כָּל יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר תֵּשֶׁב עַל הָאֲדָמָה).

In Deut 6:1-3, the land is the context prescribed for the observance of the statutes and judgments that follow in chaps. 6-11. Accordingly, Waltke, 72, argues that all of Deut 6-26 applies only to the land: "To be sure, these commands are informed by the Ten Commandments and are consistent with them so that they have binding

is reinforced by "the Law of the Prophet,"<sup>1</sup> in which the thought is developed "that through 'the prophets' later similar interpretations of the Decalogue are also possible, just as was given through Moses in the land of Moab in the form of the Deuteronomic law."<sup>2</sup> Indeed, he states that "we must consider this statement through and through as a reflective piece on the special role of the Decalogue and the historical relativity of all other legal tradition in Israel."<sup>3</sup>

---

force to the extent that they represent 'the general equity,' but they are specifically for the time Israel was in the land." However, the observance of the legislation of Deut 6-11 is not limited to the land, and indeed the initial possession of the land is elsewhere explicitly made dependent on the people's obedience to these statutes and judgments before the land is even entered. E.g., Deut 6:18, 19; 8:1; 11:8, 22-25. Accordingly, no limit seems to be placed on the extent of their applicability. Instead, Deut 6:2 simply states that they are to be kept "all the days of your life" (כל ימי חיך). On the other hand, specific restriction to the land is evident in Deut 12:1, where it is stated that the statutes and judgments that follow are to be observed "all the days that you live upon land." See Lohfink, "*huqqîm ûmišpātîm*," 23-26; idem, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 81.

For more information on the historical relativity of Deut 12-26 vis-à-vis Deut 6-11, see Kaiser, "The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law," 182, 183.

<sup>1</sup>Deut 18:9-22, especially vss. 15-18.

<sup>2</sup>"... daß durch »den Propheten« auch später noch ähnliche Explikationen des Dekalogs möglich sind, wie sie in der Gestalt des deuteronomischen Gesetzes durch Mose im Land Moab gegeben wurden." Lohfink, "Kennt das alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 81.

<sup>3</sup>"Wir müssen diese Aussage durchaus als ein Stück Reflexion über die Sonderrolle des Dekalogs und die historische Relativität aller sonstigen Rechtstradition in Israel betrachten." Ibid. Certainly, the prophet in Deut

In Deut 4:6-8, Moses reportedly tells Israel that obedience to the legislation of Deuteronomy will be "your wisdom and your discernment in the eyes of the peoples who hear of these statutes."<sup>1</sup> Not surprisingly, theonomists have cited this passage as evidence of the universal applicability of the laws of Deuteronomy.<sup>2</sup> However, Vern S. Poythress notes that from a situational perspective, Deut 4:6-8

appears to mean something quite different. The other nations admire Israel not only for the righteousness of her laws (4:8) but also for the God who is so near to Israel whenever they call on him (4:7), for the wisdom expressed as God reveals his character and salvific purposes uniquely to Israel, and for the land God gave Israel as a gift (4:5). That is to say, the nations do not notice the commandments merely as rules standing by themselves but as an expression of God's special communion with Israel. They understand the rules as what is wise for this special holy people Israel. The nations are pictured, not as saying, "We should have these same laws for ourselves," but "What a special God Israel has, what a special grace God has shown to Israel, and what wise statutes God has given them for

---

18:9-22 takes over the function of Moses in explaining the Decalogue, rather than the function of God in proclaiming it in the first place. The continued validity of the Decalogue is thus implicit here and explicit in the warning against false prophets in Deut 13:2-5. On the other hand, it may be that the prophet's words are expected to supplement the words attributed to Moses, rather than to alter them. However, the fact that loyalty to the prescriptions of Deut 12-26 is never cited as evidence of a true prophet suggests that those laws that become applicable only after the land has been entered may indeed be pictured here as being subject to prophetic modification.

הוא חכמתכם ובינתכם לעיני העמים אשר ישמעון את כל־החקים האלה.  
Deut 4:6.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Bahnsen, Theonomy, 356.



their special situation. We would certainly want to have laws just like that if we were the special chosen nation. But unfortunately we are not the special chosen nation, so it is not immediately clear that we should have precisely these laws in every case." A radical discontinuity in space exists between Israel and the other nations.<sup>1</sup>

This analysis of Poythress is especially relevant insofar as the law sets a "ritual boundary" around Israel as a people and/or around her land.<sup>2</sup> A parallel case might be "the narrow purity boundaries" set for the priests, which Israel as a whole might admire as an example of divinely given wisdom, without being expected to emulate them.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, even when a law might well apply in agricultural settings outside the land, its non-applicability in the wilderness still suggests an element of historical relativity.

On the opposite end of the spectrum to the theonomists, Griffith argues that according to Deuteronomy, the Decalogue did not exist in patriarchal times, because Deut 5:3 states that "it was not with our fathers [e.g., Abraham, Isaac, Jacob] that the LORD made this covenant,

---

<sup>1</sup>Vern S. Poythress, "Effects of Interpretive Frameworks on Application of Old Testament Law," in Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1990), 115. See also Longman, 47.

<sup>2</sup>See Ellen Juhl Christiansen, The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, vol. 27 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 52-54, 325.

but with us, with all of us who are alive here today."<sup>1</sup> He argues that the term "fathers" here "cannot refer to the parents of those in Moses' hearing who died in the wilderness; these did in fact receive the Law (Exod. 20). Therefore, it must mean the ancestors of Israel in times previous to the Exodus."<sup>2</sup> However, according to the Pentateuch's internal chronology, most of those listening to Moses' speech would not have even been born then when the Decalogue was given at Sinai. The best explanation of Deut 5:3 is that it is an example of the contemporization of a past event, in which those born later are pictured as being corporately present in the person of their ancestors (e.g., Deut 29:15 [vs. 14, Hebrew]; Josh 24:5-8).

In Hebrew idiom, the word "not" (אין) may be used "figuratively as a form of hyperbolic verbal irony intended to intensify the contrast between what is present in the mind of the audience and what ought to be present."<sup>3</sup> If such is the case in Deut 5:3, its actual meaning would be that at Horeb, Yahweh was not only making a covenant with the Fathers, but was also making one with their descendants, born and unborn alike. The question of

---

<sup>1</sup>Griffith, 59, citing the NIV, brackets his.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 60, fn. 20.

<sup>3</sup>Whitney, 152.

whether or not the patriarchs observed the Decalogue is thus simply not addressed in Deut 5:3.<sup>1</sup>

Lohfink has presented a good *prima facie* case from Deuteronomy for the perpetuity of the Decalogue and for the historical relativization of those laws that apply only after Israel has entered the promised land. However, Deut 12-26 does contain prescriptions that do apply in the wilderness, despite its particular focus on the land. For example, the law about leprosy in Deut 24:8 is supported by a reference to the wilderness period in vs. 9. Thus, there is still a need to investigate the extent of the applicability of the different prescriptions of various legal corpora on an individual basis.

In conclusion, Deuteronomy distinguishes between the Decalogue and the other legal formulations of Deuteronomy in terms of who first wrote them, the material they were written on, their place of storage, and the legal terminology used for them. The literary structure of Deuteronomy sets the Decalogue apart as the fundamental statement of law elaborated in Deut 6-26. A convincing argument may be made that in contrast to the Decalogue, Deut 12-26 as a whole applies only temporarily, since the former applies in the Wilderness, but the latter comes into force only once Israel has entered the promised land. This historical relativization is perhaps reinforced by "the Law

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Feinberg, 431.

of the Prophet" in Deut 18:9-22. However, there is still a need to investigate the extent of the applicability of the different prescriptions of various legal corpora on an individual basis.

### The Pentateuchal Sacred Times Considered Collectively

This part of the chapter is subdivided into four sections, respectively examining the מועדים in Gen 1:14, the weekly Sabbaths and annual festivals in Lev 23:37, 38, centralization in Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16, and the use of the words עולם and ידורות in connection with the Pentateuchal sacred times.

#### The מועדים in Gen 1:14

Gen 1:14, 15 reports the words attributed to God on the fourth day of creation week, when he reportedly declares his purpose in creating the heavenly luminaries. The most obvious function of "luminaries" is "to illuminate," as stated in Gen 1:15.<sup>1</sup> However, Gen 1:14 first assigns them the function of marking the passage of time:

ויאמר אלהים יהי מארת ברקיע השמים להבריל בין היום ובין הלילה  
והיו לאתת ולמועדים ולימים ושנים

---

<sup>1</sup>In support of translating מארת as "luminaries," see Victor P. Hamilton, The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990), 126, n. 1.

And God said, "Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heavens for dividing the day and the night, and let them be signs of fixed times, that is, of days and years."<sup>1</sup>

A number of scholars have interpreted the term **מוֹעֲדִים** in Gen 1:14 as a reference to annual sacred times,<sup>2</sup> and accordingly it has been argued that "annual festivals regulated by sun and moon are a creation ordinance, every bit as much as the weekly sabbath day."<sup>3</sup> In other words, Gen 1:14 has been interpreted as evidence for the permanence of the annual festivals in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a

---

<sup>1</sup>The translation of the last clause reflects the observation of E. A. Speiser, that "the sun and the moon cannot be said to determine the seasons proper; moreover, the order would then be unbalanced (one would expect: days, seasons, years). The problem solves itself once we take the first pair as a hendiadys (cf. vs. 2): they shall serve as a sign for the fixed time periods, or in other words, they shall mark the fixed times, that is, the days and the years. The use of the particle (Heb. *w<sup>e</sup>/u*) in each of these functions (hendiadys, explicative, connective) is amply attested elsewhere." E. A. Speiser, Genesis, AB, vol. 1 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1969), 6.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Sailhamer, Pentateuch, 30, 31; Solomon Gdanz, "The Calendar of Ancient Israel," in Homenaje a Millás-Vallícroso, 2 vols. (Barcelona: Consejo Superiore de Investigaciones Científicas, 1954), 1:645; Paul Beauchamp, Création et séparation: Étude exégétique du chapitre premier de la Genèse, Bibliothèque de sciences religieuses (Aubier Montaigne: Éditions du Cerf, 1969; Delachaux and Niestlé: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969), 114; Robert Davidson, Genesis 1-11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 21; Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 23. Koehler and Baumgartner, 504, also classify the use of **מוֹעֲדִים** in Gen 1:14 under the heading "**festgesetzte Zeiten, Festzeiten appointed dates, seasons of feast.**"

<sup>3</sup>Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 81.

sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. On the other hand, it is argued in this dissertation that the term מועדים in Gen 1:14 does not refer to the annual festivals, but instead refers to the daily and annual rhythms of the cycles of nature.

The noun מועד is a cognate accusative of the verb יעד, one definition of which is to "appoint a time, a place."<sup>1</sup> Thus, it is not surprising that מועד should be defined as an "appointed time, place, [or] meeting,"<sup>2</sup> although in Gen 1:14 the idea of "appointed time" is clearly in view.

There is no doubt that the term מועד is frequently used as a technical term for an annual festival (e.g., in Lev 23; Num 28-29). There is also no doubt that the word מועד is frequently used as a designation for appointed times connected to other events.<sup>3</sup> Of particular relevance to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Koehler and Baumgartner, 388, citing 2 Sam 20:5; Isa 47:7.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, 417.

<sup>3</sup>Accordingly, the word מועד is used of the preannounced time for a plague to fall (Exod 9:5; 2 Sam 24:15), and of the designated time for offering sacrifices, including the daily sacrifice (Num 28:2-8). It is also used of prearranged meeting times (1 Sam 13:8, 11; 20:35), the time allocated for the completion of a task (2 Sam 20:5), an extended period of danger (Jer 46:17), and the designated time for the fulfillment of a prophetic vision

exegesis of Gen 1:14 is the use of the term מועד to designate the cyclical rhythms of the natural world in the rebuke of Jer 8:7.<sup>1</sup>

נִסְחָסִידָה בַּשָּׁמַיִם יָדְעָה מוֹעֲדֶיהָ  
וְתֵר וְסוֹס וְעֹנָר שָׁמְרוּ אֶחְדָּעַת בָּאֵנָה  
וְעַמִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת מִשְׁפַּט יְהוָה

Even the stork in the heavens  
knows its appointed times,  
And a dove and a swallow and a crane<sup>2</sup>  
knows the time of its coming,  
But my people do not know  
the judgment of Yahweh.

Clearly the term מועדִים per se can refer either to annual festivals or to the cyclical rhythms of the natural world, and so the question arises as to whether Gen 1:14 itself defines precisely which meaning is intended.

Jordan argues that the term אֶחָד ("signs") in Gen 1:14 points to "the primary Spiritual light of God's glory," then concludes that "we are led . . . to take the next term, 'seasons,' in context as related to the special signs, and as referring primarily to appointed times of worship."<sup>3</sup> Obviously, he assumes that "the primary

---

(Hab 2:3). See Wigram, 627, 673.

<sup>1</sup>See C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, vol. 1, trans. James Martin, BC (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949), 57.

<sup>2</sup>The traditional translation of עֹנָר as crane has been retained despite the fact that its precise meaning is "very uncertain." BDB, 723.

<sup>3</sup>Jordan, Christianity and the Calendar, 81.

Spiritual light of God's glory" can be seen far more clearly in the appointment of special times of worship than in the appointment of the cycles of nature. However, this assumption betrays the very dichotomy between nature and grace he elsewhere decries.<sup>1</sup> The "signs" of Gen 1:14 can also be understood as ordering principles and guides for the cosmos rather than as signs of God's glory per se.<sup>2</sup>

There is strong evidence that the phrase **לימים ושנים** ("for days and years") at the end of Gen 1:14 is explicative of the expression **למועדים** ("for signs of fixed times").<sup>3</sup> In other words, the **מועדים** in Gen 1:14 are not defined as **מקראי קדש** ("holy times"), as in Lev 23:37.<sup>4</sup> Instead, they are simply defined as "days and years." In context, these days are the successive twenty-four-hour days of the natural cycle, each one ruled partly by the "greater luminary," the sun, and partly by the "lesser luminary," the moon, just as each of the six days of Gen 1 are also successive days each comprised of an evening and a morning. It is appropriate that the **מועדים** should also be

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 79.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see Shimon Bakon, "Sign—**אות**, Dor ledor 18 (1990): 241.

<sup>3</sup>See Speiser, 6, quoted above, p. 86, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>On the translation of the construct **מקראי קדש** in Lev 23:37 as "holy times" rather than as "holy convocations," see below, p. 91, n. 1.



defined as "years," since the circadian and annual cycles are the dominant rhythms of the natural world. On the other hand, the year-long sacred times of the Sabbatical Year and the Jubilee are never designated as **מועדים** in the Old Testament.

In conclusion, the **מועדים** of Gen 1:14 are the circadian and annual rhythms of nature, rather than the annual festivals.<sup>1</sup> There is thus no basis for suggesting that the annual festivals are here presented as a universally applicable creation ordinance.

#### Weekly Sabbaths and Annual Festivals in Lev 23:37, 38

The festal list of Lev 23:4-36 is introduced by the supplemental reference to the weekly Sabbath in vs. 3,<sup>2</sup> which forms an inclusio with the reference to "the Sabbaths of Yahweh" (**שבתת יהוה**) in the vs. 38. Vss. 37, 38 provide a summary statement of the festal list:

אלה מועדי יהוה אשר תקראו אתם מקראי קדש להקריב אשה ליהוה עלה ומנחה זבח  
ונסכים דברים ביום: מלכר שבתת יהוה ומלכר מתנותיכם ומלכר כל-נדרים  
ומלכר כל-נדרותיכם אשר תתנו ליהוה

---

<sup>1</sup>In support of this conclusion, note how the LXX translates **מועדים** as **καιρος** ("times") in Gen 1:14 and as **καιρον** ("time") in Jer 8:7, and not as **εορται** ("festivals"), as in Lev 23:2, 4, 37.

<sup>2</sup>On the relationship between the reference to the weekly Sabbath in Lev 23:2, 3 and the festal list of vss. 4-36, see below, pp. 139, 140.

- 37 These [are] the festivals of Yahweh that you shall proclaim as holy times,<sup>1</sup> in order to offer a generous gift<sup>2</sup> to Yahweh—a burnt offering and a grain offering, a sacrifice and drink offerings—<sup>3</sup> each day's amount on its day:

---

<sup>1</sup>The noun **מקרא** is obviously a cognate of the verb **קרא**, to "call," to "proclaim," to "read," or to "summons." See Koehler and Baumgartner, 849-851; BDB, 895, 896. In Num 10:2, **מקרא** clearly denotes the act of summoning a group together. Accordingly, it is not surprising that in Isa 4:5, **מקרא** has traditionally been interpreted as a "place of assembly," or that in Lev 23 and Num 28-29, **מקרא קדש** has traditionally been translated as "holy convocation" or "sacred assembly." E.g., see Koehler and Baumgartner, 562; BDB, 896. On the other hand, the same references concede that when **מקרא** is used in Neh 8:8, the actual content of a reading or proclamation is in view. Accordingly, consideration should be given to the possibility that in Lev 23 and Num 28-29, the construct chain **מקרא קדש** refers to a proclamation of holiness. In this case, the focus would be on the proclamation of a holy time rather than a holy meeting.

In this study, **מקרא קדש** has been translated as "holy time" rather than as "holy assembly," because in Lev 23:3, 24, it stands in apposition to the temporal designations **שבת שבתון** and **שבתון** respectively; in vs. 27, the Day of Atonement itself is designated as a **מקרא קדש**; and in Lev 23:4, 37 the expression **מקראי קדש** stands in apposition to temporal phrase **מועדי יהוה** ("festivals of Yahweh"). For more information, see Ernst Kutsch, "**מקרא**," ZAW 65 (1953): 247-253.

<sup>2</sup>In support of the translation of **אשה** as "generous gift" rather than as "fire-offering," see Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 162; G. R. Driver, "Ugaritic and Hebrew Words," Ugaritica 6 (1969): 181-184; Roy Gane, "'Bread of the Presence,' and Creator-in-Residence," VT 42 (1992): 195.

<sup>3</sup>As noted by the BHS apparatus, the LXX reading **όλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίας αὐτῶν καὶ σπονδάς αὐτῶν** probably reflects the Hebrew reading **עלות (יהם) וזבחייהם ונסכיהם** ("[their] burnt offerings and their sacrifices and their drink offerings") rather than the Hebrew **אלה ומנחה וזבח ונסכים** ("burnt offering and grain offering and drink offerings").

- 38 [holy times] besides the Sabbaths of Yahweh and [a generous gift] besides your gifts,<sup>1</sup> besides all your vows, and besides all your freewill offerings which you shall give to Yahweh.<sup>2</sup>

Lev 23:37 clearly links the annual festivals and the offerings prescribed for them with the verbal prepositional phrase, **להקריב** ("to offer"). An analysis of this phrase's syntactical function in the sentence confirms that the observance of the festivals is here pictured as being dependent upon the operation of the sacrificial cultus. In other words, Lev 23:37 contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

---

<sup>1</sup>In an assimilation to the list in the rest of the verse, the Samaritan Pentateuch reads **כל-מתנותיכם** ("all your gifts").

<sup>2</sup>As indicated by the bracketed additions, Lev 23:38a is here read as a qualification of vs. 37a, and vs. 38b is read as a qualification of vs. 37b. This reading is followed by the NIV in an alternative footnote translation. However, in the main body of its text vs. 37b is evidently interpreted as the referent for the whole of vs. 38: "These offerings are in addition to those for the LORD's Sabbaths and in addition to your gifts and whatever you have vowed and all the freewill offerings you give the LORD." However, there is no sound basis for interpreting **שבתת יהוה** as a reference to offerings for the Sabbaths of Yahweh rather than to the Sabbaths themselves.

Occasionally, the ל plus infinitive construction can play a dative role in a sentence, or serve as an adverbial expression after a noun.<sup>1</sup> The clause "להקריב" . . . in Lev 23:37 would then respectively qualify either the phrase מועדי יהוה ("festivals of Yahweh"),<sup>2</sup> or the phrase מקראי קדש ("holy times").<sup>3</sup> However, elsewhere in the Old Testament the prepositional phrase להקריב always qualifies a verb rather than a noun.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, in the absence of any clear evidence to the contrary, the clause in Lev 23:37 should be interpreted as an adverbial clause qualifying the verb תקראו ("you shall proclaim").

The function of the clause ". . . להקריב" could be gerundive, as in Num 15:13, leading to the translation, "These are the festivals of Yahweh that you shall proclaim

---

<sup>1</sup>Waltke and O'Connor, 605, 606.

<sup>2</sup>Leading to the translation, "These festivals of Yahweh, that you shall proclaim as holy times, [are] for offering a gift to Yahweh/when a gift is offered to Yahweh."

<sup>3</sup>Leading to the translation, "These [are] the festivals of Yahweh that you shall proclaim as holy times for offering a gift to Yahweh/when a gift is offered to Yahweh."

<sup>4</sup>E.g., see Lev 7:38; 17:4; 21:17, 21; Num 9:7; 15:13; 16:9; 28:2; Judg 3:18; 2 Chr 35:12; Ezek 44:15. See Wigram, 1124.

as holy times by offering a gift to Yahweh."<sup>1</sup> However, there is no Old Testament evidence that sacrifice is the method by which a holy time is proclaimed. Instead, the proclamation of a holy time always precedes sacrifice, as in 2 Chr 30. "The original meaning of the ל is most plainly seen in those infinitives with ל which expressly state a purpose."<sup>2</sup> It is therefore here proposed that the construction ". . . להקריב" in Lev 23:37 is a purpose clause, leading to the translation, "These are the festivals of Yahweh that you shall proclaim as holy times, in order to offer a gift to Yahweh."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>On the gerundive function of the ל plus infinitive construction, see Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 351; Waltke and O'Connor, 608; Paul Joüon, S.J., A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, trans. and rev. T. Muraoka, reprint of 1st ed., with corrections, 2 vols, *Subsidia biblica*, no. 14 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993), 437, 438.

<sup>2</sup>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 348.

<sup>3</sup>The construction ". . . להקריב" is simply a verbal complement in Lev 7:38; Num 9:7; 28:2; Judg 3:18; Ezek 44:15. However, in each case, the clause it introduces is needed for the sentence to make sense, whereas Lev 23:37a could clearly stand as a sentence on its own.

There are six clear Old Testament examples of the use of the construction ". . . להקריב" as a purpose clause. In Lev 17:4 it expresses the purpose of bringing an animal to the doorway of the tent of meeting ("to offer an offering to Yahweh"), while in Lev 21:17, 21 it expresses the purpose of a priest making an approach ("to offer the bread of his God" and "to offer the gifts of Yahweh" respectively). In Num 16:9 it expresses God's purpose in separating the Levites from the rest of Israel ("to bring you near to him"), while in 2 Chr 35:12 it expresses the purpose of the Levites in distributing the Passover offerings to the people ("to offer [them] to Yahweh as

The implication of this translation is that the specific purpose of proclaiming the **מוערי יהוה** ("festivals of Yahweh") as **מקראי קדש** ("holy times") is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> In other words, servile work is not to be done during the annual **מקראי קדש** because they mark important points of transition in the sacrificial calendar. The observance of these holy times thus depends upon the operation of the sacrificial system, and the obligation to rest on them presumably ceases in the absence of the cultus.<sup>2</sup>

---

written in the book of Moses"). In Ezek 44:15 it expresses the purpose of the Levitical priests in standing before Yahweh ("to offer me fat and blood").

<sup>1</sup>It is true that in Lev 23:2, 4, the construct chains **מוערי יהוה** and **מקראי קדש** stand in apposition. However, "the **מוערי יהוה** are too comprehensive in connotation to be identified with the **מקראי קדש** alone. . . . In both seven (eight) day festivals (5-8, 34b-36) there is a **מקרא קדש** on the first and the last days. However the feasts (**מוערים**) themselves consist of more than just those two days." Donn F. Morgan, "The So-Called Cultic Calendars in the Pentateuch: A Morphological and Typological Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974), 182, n. 44. Certainly, the proclamation of the **מקראי קדש** does mark the boundaries of these festivals.

<sup>2</sup>Note the comment by Morgan, 173, that the prohibition of work in the festival context "should not be interpreted as a social regulation but rather a ritual regulation. The act of ceasing work is not envisioned as a means of allowing man to rest himself and his household but is rather a requirement necessary for the observance of a holy convocation."

Lev 23:37, 38 indicates that the term מועדים is a technical designation only for the annual festivals, and emphasizes that the observance of the annual מקראי קדש is required besides the observance of "the Sabbaths of Yahweh" (מלכר שבתת יהוה) or weekly Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> This fact in and of itself need not imply that the weekly Sabbath stands in a different relationship to the cultus than the annual holy days. However, it does leave this possibility open.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, Lev 23:37, 38 shows that the proclamation of מקראי קדש ("holy times") during the annual festivals presupposes the continued operation of the sacrificial cultus. However, it leaves open the possibility that the weekly Sabbath has a different relationship to the cultus.

Centralization in Exod 23:17; 34:23;  
and Deut 16:16

In Exod 23:17; 34:23; and Deut 16:16, all Israelite males are commanded to appear "before Yahweh" three times a year, for the Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread,<sup>3</sup> the

---

<sup>1</sup>On the way that Lev 23:38 forms an inclusio with vs. 3, see above, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup>See below, pp. 138-141 on the Sabbath in Lev 23:2, 3.

<sup>3</sup>The Passover is not explicitly mentioned as one of these occasions in either Exod 23 or 34. However, Deut 16:1-8 rightly concludes that if the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread begin together, they should both be placed at the same locale.

Feast of Harvest/Weeks, and the Feast of Ingathering/  
Booths.

The list of the three annual feasts in the covenant code begins in Exod 23:14 and climaxes in vs. 17:

שִׁלֹּשׁ פַּעֲמִים בַּשָּׁנָה יֵרָאֶה כָּל־זָכוּר אֶל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדֹנָי יְהוִה

Three times in the year shall your every male appear<sup>1</sup>  
before the Lord Yahweh.<sup>2</sup>

The covenant is renewed in Exod 34:10-28. The  
festal list begins in vs. 22 and climaxes in vs. 23:

שִׁלֹּשׁ פַּעֲמִים בַּשָּׁנָה יֵרָאֶה כָּל־זָכוּר אֶת־פְּנֵי הָאֲדֹנָי יְהוִה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Three times in the year shall your every male appear  
before the Lord Yahweh, God of Israel.

Towards the end of the most detailed of the three  
festal lists in Deut 16:1-17 comes the statement of vs. 16:

שִׁלֹּשׁ פַּעֲמִים בַּשָּׁנָה יֵרָאֶה כָּל־זָכוּר אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוִה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר בַּחֹג הַמִּצֻּוֹת  
וּבְחֹג הַשִּׁבְעוֹת וּבְחֹג הַסֻּכּוֹת וְלֹא יֵרָאֶה אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוִה רֵיקָם

---

<sup>1</sup>It is possible that in all three texts (Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16) יֵרָאֶה should be pointed as a Qal stem (יֵרָאֶה, "shall see") rather than as a Niphal stem (יֵרָאֶה, "shall appear"), just as יֵרָאֵי is pointed as a Qal stem in the Massoretic reading of Exod 24:10; Deut 31:11.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch's reading of אֵת instead of אֵל is an assimilation to Exod 34:23 and Deut 16:16, while its reading of אֲרֹן יְהוִה ("Ark of Yahweh") instead of הָאֲדֹנָי יְהוִה ("the Lord Yahweh") is a readily understandable variant. The LXX assimilates to Deut 16:16 when it concludes Exod 23:17 with the expression σὺς τοῦ σολῶτα σολῶτα (יהוה אלהיך in Deut 16:16).



Three times in the year your every male must appear before Yahweh your God in the place that he chooses:<sup>1</sup> at the Feast of Unleavened Bread, at the Feast of Weeks, and at the Feast of Booths, and he must not appear<sup>2</sup> before Yahweh empty-handed.

These three passages call for the centralized observance of the חגים or "pilgrim feasts" three times a year,<sup>3</sup> and may thus contain a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch adds the prepositional phrase **בֵּי** after **בָּחַר** leading to the translation, "in the place where (literally, "in which") he chooses." In an instance of dittography the LXX explicitly identifies the subject of **בָּחַר** ("he chooses") as **יְהוָה** (יהוה).

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch's reading of the plural **יֵרָאוּ** ("they must appear") instead of the singular **יֵרָא** ("he must appear") is an assimilation to Exod 23:15 and 34:20.

<sup>3</sup>It is sometimes argued that in Exod 23:17 Yahweh's presence is located in one of many sanctuaries, and that the expression **בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ** ("the house of Yahweh your God") in vs. 19 refers to the individual sanctuary of each particular settlement. E.g., see Martin Noth, Exodus: A Commentary, trans. J. S. Bowden, OTL (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962), 192. However, in the context of Exodus and its final form, the House of Yahweh must refer to the sanctuary of Exod 25-40.

In the case of Exod 34:23, Noth himself concedes that the concern over land tenure addressed in Exod 34:24 only makes sense in the context of a central rather than local sanctuaries. Ibid., 264.

There is no doubt that Deut 16 clearly calls for a centralized observance of these feasts. "No less than six times in the seventeen verses of Deuteronomy's festal calendar is the demand made, sometimes in near polemical terms: 'Not . . . within your gates, . . . but only at the place which Yahweh your God shall choose, to establish his name there.'" Kiker, 94, 95.

observance. The key question is whether centralization here is pictured merely as the ideal circumstance for observing these feasts, or whether it is pictured as an absolute necessity.

Centralization in the Pentateuch appears to be an ideal insisted upon according to the degree of practicality involved in its implementation. For example, despite the Deuteronomic stress on centralization, in Deut 12:15 there seems to be a relaxation of the statute in Lev 17:3-7 that all slaughtered animals be brought "to the opening of the tent of meeting" (Lev 17:4). Numerous hypotheses have been advanced to explain this relaxation.<sup>1</sup> However, in the context of the final form of the Pentateuch, it is probably best understood as an accommodation to an anticipated post-settlement increase in the distance between the population and the tabernacle and in the rate of meat consumption.<sup>2</sup> Even the foundational call for the centralization of the sacrificial system in Deut 12:10, 11 presupposes that

---

<sup>1</sup>For a summary, see Gilbert George Braithwaite, "The Doctrine of the Central Sanctuary in Deuteronomy" (Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978), 81-83.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 83-85; Peter C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1976), 218, 219.

Israel will be given rest from her enemies before centralization becomes an absolute norm:<sup>1</sup>

ועברתם את הירדן וישבתם בארץ אשר יהיה לכם מנוח ויהיה לכם מנוח  
איביכם מסביב וישבתם בשלום והיה המקום אשר יבחר יהוה אלהיכם בו לשכון  
שמו שם שמה תביאו את כל אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם עולתכם וזבחיכם מעשרתכם  
ותרמת ידכם וכל מבחר נדריכם אשר תדרו ליהוה

- 10 You will cross the Jordan and live in the land that Yahweh your God is about to make you inherit. He will give you rest from all your enemies around about and you will dwell safely.
- 11 Then it shall be that you will bring to the place that Yahweh your God<sup>2</sup> chooses<sup>3</sup> for his name to dwell everything that I am commanding you:<sup>4</sup> your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes<sup>5</sup> and the offering of your hand,<sup>6</sup> and all your best vows that you vow to Yahweh.

---

<sup>1</sup>For more information, see Braithwaite, 170-181, who interprets the non-sanctuary offerings of Samuel and Elijah in terms of such contingencies.

<sup>2</sup>Some LXX manuscripts clearly read the second person singular אלהיך instead of the second person plural אלהיכם, while others evidently read the first person plural אלהינו ("our God"). Targum Pseudo-Jonathan does not translate אלהים.

<sup>3</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the perfect בחר ("has chosen") instead of the imperfect יבחר ("chooses").

<sup>4</sup>The LXX assimilates to Deut 11:8 when it adds σήμερον, the equivalent of היום ("today").

<sup>5</sup>Two Massoretic manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch have the connective waw ("and") before מעשרתכם ("your tithes"). This reading is reflected by the LXX, the Syriac, and the Vulgate.

<sup>6</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has ותרמתכם ונדבתיכם ("and your offerings and your vows") instead of ותרמת ידכם ("and the offering of your hand"). The LXX, followed by the Syriac, evidently reads ידכם ("your hands") instead of ידכם ("your hand").

As for the "pilgrim feasts," a central shrine is not a feature of the Exod 12 account of the first Passover in Egypt. Admittedly, a caution must be raised about using the details of this account as a model for future Passover observance.<sup>1</sup> However, in view of such evidence, it would be unwise to insist that centralization is an absolutely essential feature of the observance of these feasts, just on the basis of Exod 23:17; 34:23 and Deut 16:16. Of course, there may still be evidence elsewhere of geographical limitations to the observance of the "pilgrim feasts."<sup>2</sup>

#### The Pentateuchal Sacred Times and the Words עולם and דורות

In the Pentateuch the words עולם and דורות are often used chronologically in commands to observe the various sacred times,<sup>3</sup> and it is perhaps not surprising that such

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, pp. 155, 156.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see below, p. 162, on Num 9:10-12, and below, p. 288, on Hos 9:1-6.

<sup>3</sup>As for the term עולם, the weekly Sabbath is designated as a ברית עולם (Exod 31:16) and as an אות ("sign") between Yahweh and the Children of Israel לעולם (vs. 17). The offering of "the bread of the presence" each Sabbath is also called a ברית עולם (Lev 24:8), and it is commanded that the Passover be observed as a statute ער עולם (Exod 12:24). The designation חקת עולם is used in connection with the weekly Sabbath (Lev 24:8); the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:14, 17); the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:14); the Feast of Weeks (Lev 23:21); the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29, 31, 34; 23:31), and the Feast of

texts have been cited as evidence for the perpetuity of these times.<sup>1</sup> In other words, these passages have been cited as evidence of the permanence of some of the Pentateuchal sacred times in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem.

Against this argument it should be noted that the term עולם may simply denote "a long time" or "long duration," and its connotation of "eternity" is "not to be

---

Booths (Lev 23:41). See Wigram, 907.

As for the term דורות, in Exod 12 it is commanded that the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread be observed לרדתיכם, "throughout your generations" (vss. 14, 17) and לדרתם, "throughout their generations" (vs. 42). In Exod 30:10 the Day of Atonement offering is to be made לרדתיכם. In Exod 31 the Sabbath is a sign between Yahweh and Israel לדתיכם (vs. 13) to be observed לדרתם (vs. 16). In Lev 23 the expression לדתיכם is used in connection with the offering of the wavesheaf (vs. 14), the prohibitions against work on the Feast of Weeks (vs. 21) and the Day of Atonement (vs. 31), and the observance of the Feast of Booths (vs. 41). For a listing of Old Testament uses of דור ("generation") see Wigram, 337, 338.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see God's Festivals and Holy Days, 8, 9, 28, 33, 34.

understood philosophically."<sup>1</sup> The emphasis is thus on incalculability rather than on endlessness per se.<sup>2</sup>

As for the word דורות ("generations"), Robert D.

Culver explains that

by a thoroughly understandable figure, a man's lifetime beginning with the womb of earth and returning thereto (Gen 3:19) is a *dôr*; likewise from the conception and birth of a man to the conception and birth of his offspring is a *dôr*. A period of extended time and several other related meanings would be inevitable in a language prone to metaphors.<sup>3</sup>

Culver notes three such related metaphoric meanings.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Koehler and Baumgartner, 688. See also Ernst Jenni, "עולם *ʿolām* Ewigkeit," Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament (1984), 2:229, 230. "The word [עולם] in itself" does not contain "the idea of endlessness," as "is shown . . . by the fact that . . . some-times [*sic*]" it refers "to events or conditions that occurred at a definite point in the past." Alan A. MacRae, "עולם (*ʿlām*)," TWOT (1980), 2:672, 673. It also does not always denote endlessness in the future. E.g., see H. Preuß, "עולם *ʿolām*," TWAT (1986), 5:1149, citing Exod 21:6; Deut 15:17; 1 Sam 27:12.

<sup>2</sup>MacRae, 672, 673. Holbrook, 6, comments that "the emphasis of the Hebrew and Greek terms translated 'forever' in the bible [*sic*] is on duration. A thing or person exists continuously without break—endlessly or until it comes to an end—according to its nature." However, the emphasis of עולם in temporal prepositional phrases is on incalculability rather than on duration, as illustrated by the fact that the possession of the land "forever" is thematically developed in passages that are clearly not preexilic (e.g., Jer 7:7; 25:5; 2 Chr 20:7). For more information, see Preuß, 1150.

<sup>3</sup>Robert D. Culver, "דור (*dûr*) heap up, pile, dwell," TWOT (1980), 1:186.

<sup>4</sup>I.e., "one group—as opposed to a single person—as related to another by natural descent (Jud 2:10). . . . 'contemporaries,' . . . [or] a class of men distinguished by a certain moral or spiritual character."

However, he recognizes that in the Old Testament "the chronological use is predominant."<sup>1</sup> He also notes that in this sense it is "often paralleled [sic; should be paralleled] with other concrete terms as <sup>עולם</sup> "forever" (Ps 89:1 [H2])."<sup>2</sup> Like <sup>עולם</sup>, the word דֹר "can simply mean 'age' (*doroth ʿolamim*, 'generations of primeval time,' Isa. 51:9; *dor riʿshon*, 'the earlier generation,' Job 8:8)."<sup>3</sup> In Akkadian, the cognate noun *dāru(m)* has the meaning of "duration" and "a long time" rather than simply the philosophical meaning of eternity,<sup>4</sup> and in Arabic the cognate noun *dahr* may mean "time" or "a long while" as well as "endless time" or "eternity."<sup>5</sup>

In conclusion, the words <sup>עולם</sup> and דורות emphasize the incalculability of the time period during which the sacred times are to apply, rather than a lack of a terminus ad quem per se.

---

Ibid., 187.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>G. J. Botterweck, D. N. Freedman, and J. Lundbom, "דֹר *dôr*," TDOT (1978), 3:175.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 170.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 172.

The Pentateuchal Sacred Times  
Considered Individually

In this part of the chapter, consideration is given to each one of the eleven Pentateuchal sacred times in turn, in descending order of their prescribed frequency of observance. Accordingly, the weekly Sabbath is considered first, followed by the New Moon, the seven annual festivals, and finally the Sabbatical Year and the Jubilee. The annual festivals are each examined in the order of their respective chronological positions in the calendar. In each subsection, the relevant texts are examined according to their order in the canon.

The Sabbath

Gen 2:1-3

The creation account of Gen 1:1-2:3 climaxes with the description of events on the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3:<sup>1</sup>

ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל־צבאם: ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת  
ביום השביעי מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה: ויברך אלהים את־יום השביעי ויקדש אתו כי  
בו שבת מכל־מלאכתו אשר־ברא אלהים לעשות

- 1 And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their hosts.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 7.



- 2 And on the seventh day God declared work that he had done finished,<sup>1</sup> and he ceased<sup>2</sup> on the seventh day from all his work that he had made.
- 3 And God blessed the seventh day and declared it holy, because on it he ceased from all his work that God had created and made.

In this study it is argued that Gen 2:1-3 presents the weekly Sabbath as originating at creation. In other words, this passage provides *prima facie* support for the permanence of the Sabbath in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

It is also argued here that Gen 2:1-3 presents the weekly Sabbath as "a temple in time,"<sup>3</sup> universally accessible everywhere, independent of the possession of land or temple. In other words, this passage indicates a lack of geographic limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is

---

<sup>1</sup>The harder Massoretic reading of **ביום השביעי** ("on the seventh day") is here preferred to the reading of **ביום הששי** ("on the sixth day") in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX, and the Syriac. The consecutive verb **ויכל** is here taken to be a declarative Piel, just as the verb **ויקרא** is in Gen 2:3. See below, p. 113. However, it is conceivable that **ויכל** should be translated as a pluperfect (i.e., "he had finished"). E.g., see Andreasen, 63, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>On the primary meaning of the verb **שבת** as "to cease," see Victor P. Hamilton, "**שָׁבַת** (*shābat*) cease, desist, rest," TWOT (1980), 2:902.

<sup>3</sup>Compare Heschel's designation of the weekly Sabbath as "a palace in time" and as "holiness in time." Heschel, 12, 78.

permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

#### Gen 2:1-3 and the origin of the Sabbath

In contrast to Exod 20:9-11 and 31:15-17, nothing is said in Gen 2:1-3 about God's rest on the seventh day of creation week serving as a model for Sabbath observance. However, given the context of the Pentateuch as a whole, "the reader . . . cannot help but have such things in mind."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it is only natural that Gen 2:1-3 should be interpreted as placing the institution of the weekly Sabbath at creation. On the other hand, those

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert D. Sacks, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies, vol. 6 (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon Press, 1990), 17.

It has been suggested that "the seven-day scheme was attached to the creation account prior to the association between the seventh day and the creation Sabbath," and "that the creation account belongs to the cult liturgy of a New Year festival, i.e., an Israelite counterpart to the Babylonian New Year Festival." Andreasen, 187. However, Andreasen, 188, rightly notes the increasingly cautious nature of proposed reconstructions of this festival, and the consequent realization that "the so-called cultic-ritualistic elements in Gen. 1:1-2:3 are far less prominent than was once thought."

Meier, 6, notes that a large number of passages in the so-called "P" corpus specifically refer to "the seventh day" of a number of different purification cycles, and argues that these cycles form the most immediate context for understanding the seventh day of Gen 2:1-3. However, the seventh day of these purification cycles is never explicitly linked to the seventh day of creation. On the other hand, just such a link is explicitly made between the seventh-day Sabbath and the seventh day of creation in Exod 20:9-11 and 31:15-17. Accordingly, there can be little doubt that even if one accepts the documentary hypothesis, any final redactor would have had this link in mind in the context of Gen 2:1-3.

interpreters who do not see a creation ordinance in Gen 2:1-3 typically point to the absence of the noun **שָׁבָת** and to the absence of any actual command to rest.<sup>1</sup> However, while the noun **שָׁבָת** may be absent in Gen 2:1-3, the verb **שָׁבַת** in vss. 2, 3 is cognate to it.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the noun **שָׁבָת** is also absent in Exod 23:12 and 31:17,<sup>3</sup> yet few interpreters would argue that "the seventh day" here refers to anything other than the weekly Sabbath.

As for the absence of an actual command to rest in Gen 2:1-3, the best explanation is probably that Gen 1:1-2:3 is not meant to be an etiology of the Sabbath.<sup>4</sup> Instead, the author's intention is probably to demythologize the common ancient Near Eastern idea of a divine otiositas or rest, according to which the gods permanently retire from lordship over the world once man has been created.<sup>5</sup> As Andreasen comments:

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Congdon, 127, 128, 134, 135; Griffith, 32, 43, 44.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see Hamilton, "שָׁבָת," 902; E. Haag, "שָׁבָת *šabbāt*," *TWAT* (1993), 7:1047. For a more extended discussion, see Andreasen, 100-104.

<sup>3</sup>Andreasen, 121.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>5</sup>For examples of how Gen 1-2 polemicizes against other aspects of ancient Near Eastern mythology, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis 1 in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," *AUSS* 10 (1972): 1-20; *idem*, "The Polemical Nature of the Genesis Cosmology," *Evangelical Quarterly* 46 (1974): 81-102.

That the creator should rest after making the world and mankind, but before making his people Israel, is to the Old Testament . . . a preposterous idea. . . . It must be said, therefore, that Gen. 2:1-3 is not portraying a divine otiositas, in the sense of a divine retirement from active engagement into the affairs of the world, but that the divine otiositas motif is present in a unique way in Gen. 2:1-3, namely, as a creation Sabbath . . . for the author of Gen. 1:1-2, 4 understood the otiositas simply as a Sabbath, the first Sabbath.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, in Gen 2:1-3,

the Sabbath is not a heavenly Sabbath, nor a divine Sabbath, but the creation Sabbath; and even if it originally stood in a relationship to the divine otiositas, . . . here it is after all only a Sabbath, namely, the seventh day, lasting twenty-four hours, and not a perpetual rest.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andreasen, 186.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 196. It is sometimes argued that the seventh day in Gen 2:1-3 should not be understood as a literal day, since the formula "and there was evening and there was morning" is not used to describe it. E.g., Griffith, 46, 47. However, this omission may only be an "example of the break up of a stereotypic pattern upon reaching the climactic crescendo conclusion." Shalom M. Paul, Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos, Herm (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 76.

Griffith, 48, objects that "if God's rest referred to cessation from creative activity for only twenty-four hours, it logically follows that this creative work resumed on the eighth day, . . . a deduction to which no one wants to ascribe." However, he has overlooked the argument that the difference between the seventh day and the subsequent days "consists in the novel character of the seventh day; after a series of six days on each of which some work of creation was wrought, came a day on which God did not work or add anything to his creation; hence the remembrance of this abstinence from labour remained linked with the day on which this situation first arose." Cassuto, 1:64.

Griffith, 49, 50, argues from Heb 4 that God's creation "rest has a future aspect and thus cannot be limited solely to the twenty-four hour period following the creation." However, he has overlooked the observation that "true as it is that the sabbath of God has no evening, and that the σαββατισμός, to which the creature is to attain at the end of his course, will be bounded by no evening, but

In other words, there may be no command for man to keep the Sabbath in Gen 2:1-3, because the passage is primarily concerned with God's Sabbath-keeping rather than with man's.<sup>1</sup>

The question may arise as to whether only God rests in Gen 2:1-3 and Man is invited to enter that rest in Exod 20:8-11. However, the call for human Sabbath-keeping is still implicit in God's Sabbath-keeping, and in his sanctification and blessing of the seventh day in Gen 2:3. Even if Gen 2:1-3 is not etiological, it is still "hard to suggest any reason for Creation taking six days other than that of paving the way for the divine example of Sabbathkeeping [sic; should be Sabbath-keeping]."<sup>2</sup>

---

last for ever; we must not, without further ground, introduce this true and profound idea into the seventh creation-day." Keil and Delitzsch, 69. See also Andreasen, 225.

<sup>1</sup>Niels-Erik Andreasen, Rest and Redemption: A Study of the Biblical Sabbath, AUM, Studies in Religion, vol. 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978), 75, 76.

<sup>2</sup>Ford, 80. "Whatever problems a typical reader of Genesis 1 may have with its creation story, they rarely include a puzzlement about God's resting on the seventh day. Yet even on a little reflection that rest reveals the kind of anthropomorphism which all too often aggravates biblical parlance about God. . . . [The prohibition of idolatry] forcibly reminded even the most earthy Jew of the non-material nature of the true God. But if God was so different from anything material, what could be the reason for the emphatic assertion that He ceased from His work of six days by taking a rest on the seventh? . . . Clearly, one is faced here with a divine role model set for man." Stanley L. Jaki, "The Sabbath-Rest of the Maker of All," Asbury Theological Journal 50/1 (Spring 1995): 37, 38.

Furthermore, the last section of each successive genealogy in Genesis is always "the one which announces the following history," and thus the divine Sabbath-keeping clearly begins "the new history, the human one."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the divine rest clearly has implications on the human level as the point where divinity and humanity meet.<sup>2</sup>

Gen 2:1-3 is not only the climax of the whole of Gen 1:1-2:3,<sup>3</sup> it is also a tightly knit unit in its own right, "a unified composition which does not let the reader bracket out any traditions within it with any degree of certainty."<sup>4</sup> Thus, the blessing and sanctification of the seventh day in Gen 2:3 is "the planned climax to which the earlier verses move,"<sup>5</sup> and the narrator clearly intends to picture them as happening at the end of creation week. All

---

<sup>1</sup>Jacques Doukhan, The Genesis Creation Story: Its Literary Structure, AUSDDS, vol. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978), 221, 222. See also Richard S. Hess, "Genesis 1-2 in Its Literary Context," TB 41 (1990): 143-153.

<sup>2</sup>Meier has argued that Gen 2:1-3 envisages no rest for humankind. Instead, "God's rest is made possible because there is a substitute in his image delegated to maintain the world order and ensure the fruitfulness of the earth." Meier, 5. However, this assertion seems to be based on a facile reading of the motif of divine otiositas in other ancient Near Eastern traditions into the context of Genesis, without any consideration of how dramatically Gen 2:1-3 reinterprets it. See above, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., see Ian Hart, "Genesis 1:1-2:3 as Prologue," TB 46 (1995): 324, 325.

<sup>4</sup>Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 191.

<sup>5</sup>Ford, 80.

the blessings in Gen 1 clearly have creation and humanity in view, and become operative at the moment that blessing is made. Accordingly, it is only to be expected that it would be "with respect to his creation, and with respect to man in particular that God blessed the Sabbath day,"<sup>1</sup> and that the blessing would immediately be operative from the first seventh day onwards.<sup>2</sup>

Griffith acknowledges the difficulty that "a sanctified day not yet instituted" poses for his thesis,<sup>3</sup> and so suggests that at creation

God blessed and set apart the day for its future use as a day of rest and worship for Israel under the Law. . . . In like manner He set apart Jeremiah while in the womb (Jer. 1:5), though his ministry as a prophet did not commence until years later.<sup>4</sup>

However, the difference between Jeremiah and the seventh day is that Jeremiah had to be born, grow, and mature before he could assume the prophetic office. On the other

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, 69.

<sup>2</sup>See also Hasel, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch," 25.

<sup>3</sup>Griffith, 33.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. Jer 1:5 reads as follows:

בשרם אצורך בבטן ירעהיך ובשרם חצא מרחם הקדשתיך נביא לנזם נחחך

"Before I formed you in the womb,

I knew you.

"And before you came forth from the womb,

I sanctified you.

"[As] a prophet for the nations,

I appointed you."

The LXX in the Catenarian tradition clearly reads לנז ("for the nation") rather than לנזם ("for the nations"). However, this reading lacks adequate support elsewhere.

hand, the seventh day as an impersonal abstract object did not have to grow or mature.

Griffith undertakes no syntactical analysis of the use of the Piel stem of קִדֵּשׁ ("to sanctify") in Gen 2:3 when he simply equates it with the causative use of the Hiphil stem of קִדֵּשׁ in Jer 1:5. In the Old Testament, whenever the Piel stem of קִדֵּשׁ is used with a period of time as an object, it is never factitive. Instead, it is always either estimative, referring to the actual observance of a holy time,<sup>1</sup> or declarative, emphasizing "a public proclamation."<sup>2</sup> In Gen 2:3, the estimative use of the Piel can be ruled out, since the text does not state that God sanctifies the seventh day by stopping on it, but instead that he sanctifies it because he then ceases his work. Accordingly, the Piel here must be declarative, with an emphasis on the public proclamation of the sanctity of the seventh day right at the time of creation.

Even if it is conceded for argument's sake that the Piel stem of קִדֵּשׁ in Gen 2:3 may be factitive, it cannot automatically be equated with the causative use of the Hiphil stem of קִדֵּשׁ in Jer 1:5, for it has recently been

---

<sup>1</sup>As in Exod 20:8; Lev 25:10; Deut 5:12; Neh 13:29; Jer 17:22, 24, 27, listed in Wigram, 1090.

<sup>2</sup>Ford, 80, citing Exod 19:12, 23; Josh 20:9; Joel 1:14; 2:15. See also Lev 25:10; 2 Kgs 10:20, as listed by Wigram, 1090.



argued that when a stative, intransitive root is used, "the [factitive] *Piel* verbs . . . direct attention to the results of the situation apart from the event . . . , and the [causative] *Hiphils* refer to the process."<sup>1</sup> The use of the *Hiphil* stem of קרשׁ in Jer 1:5 would thus stress the process by which Yahweh has set Jeremiah apart as a prophet from the outset, irrespective of when he might actually assume the prophetic office. However, the use of the *Piel* stem of קרשׁ in Gen 2:3 would stress that here is an action whose results are evident immediately, and the canonical picture of the creation origin of the Sabbath would be clearly affirmed.

To summarize, this study of Gen 2:1-3 has shown that the Sabbath is pictured here as a creation ordinance intended for humanity as a whole.

Gen 2:1-3 and the Sabbath  
as a temple in time

Gen 2:1-3 presents the Sabbath as a temple in time, universally accessible everywhere, independent of the possession of land or of a temple in space.

---

<sup>1</sup>Waltke and O'Connor, 438, citing as an example the contrast between the use of the *Piel* of קרשׁ in 1 Sam 7:1 and the *Hiphil* of קרשׁ in Lev 27:16. See also Ernst Jenni, Das Hebraische Pi<sup>c</sup>el (Zürich: EVZ, 1968), 20-52. For an opposing viewpoint, see W. T. Claassen, "On a Recent Proposal as to a Distinction between Pi<sup>c</sup>el and Hiph<sup>c</sup>il," Journal of North-Western Semitic Languages 1 (1971): 3-10.

Howard N. Wallace discerns two patterns in the Enuma Elish and in Ugaritic myth and epic: that of the divine otiositas, and the pattern "end of creation—proclamation of sovereignty—construction of sanctuary."<sup>1</sup> He notes the reflection of the first pattern in Gen 2:1-3, then adds that "it is difficult to conceive . . . that this pattern could be divorced in the hearer's mind from the second, wherein the temple is the symbol of the presence and the sovereignty of the deity."<sup>2</sup> In other words, "in the creation account, the construction of the heavenly sanctuary, which usually concludes ancient Near Eastern creation myths, has been replaced by the motif of the divine rest."<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, once the temple has been destroyed, the Sabbath can function as a substitute means of celebrating the sovereignty of Yahweh for "those in

---

<sup>1</sup>Howard N. Wallace, "Genesis 2:1-3—Creation and Sabbath," Pacifica 1 (1988): 243.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 235. See also M. Fishbane, Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), 12, 13, and Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the LORD--the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3," in Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles, ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor, Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 212 (Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon und Bercker, 1981), 504. On evidence that the Garden of Eden is presented as a sanctuary in the Genesis narrative, see above, p. 74.

exile, who live at a distance from the sacred space of the temple now destroyed."<sup>1</sup>

Wallace adds that "Andreasen has raised some doubts about seeing the sabbath as a substitute for the temple. He notes, quite rightly, that many exilic and post-exilic works give a great deal of attention to the temple and Jerusalem."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, he contends that "Andreasen juxtaposes 'holy time' with 'holy place' too sharply," and that the link between the Sabbath and sanctuary in Gen 2:1-3 does "provide a transition mechanism whereby that which is signified in the temple can be maintained and upheld in the shadow of the destruction of the sanctuary."<sup>3</sup>

Given the link between the divine otiositas and divine temple building in the mythology of the ancient Near East, Wallace is correct in insisting that "holy place" and "holy time" not be too sharply juxtaposed. Accordingly, Gen 2:1-3 presents the Sabbath as an institution that can function effectively, even in the face of the destruction of holy place and the loss of the holy land.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wallace, 243.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 249, citing Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 237, 238.

<sup>3</sup>Wallace, 249, 250.

<sup>4</sup>In fairness to Andreasen, it should be noted that he does not totally juxtapose "holy time" and "holy place," as is evident in his concession that "the sabbath unlike any holy place or object has retained a universal quality."

Exod 16

The account of the giving of the manna in Exod 16 contains the first uncontroverted reference to human Sabbath-keeping in the canon. In Exod 16:4 it is stated that by giving the people bread, Yahweh will test whether or not the people will walk in his law (תורה). Each day the people are to gather a portion for that day, but on the sixth day they are to gather twice as much as on the previous days (vs. 5). Vs. 23 explains the reason for the extra collection of food on the sixth day:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה שְׁכֶתוֹן שַׁבַּת-קֹדֶשׁ לִיהוָה מָחָר  
אֶת אֲשֶׁר-תֹּאמְרוּ אִפּוֹ וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר-תִּבְשְׁלוּ בִשְׁלוּ וְאֵת כָּל-הָעֶרֶף הַנִּיחוּ לָכֶם  
לְמִשְׁמֶרֶת עַד-בֹּקֶר

Then he told them,<sup>1</sup> "This [is] what Yahweh has said,<sup>2</sup> 'Tomorrow [is] a rest day, a holy Sabbath to Yahweh. Bake what you will bake and boil what you will boil, and put all that remains aside for safekeeping until the morning.'"

Exod 16:24 reports the people's compliance with this instruction. Vss. 25, 26 report further instruction given on the seventh day:

---

Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Recent Studies of the Old Testament Sabbath," ZAW 86 (1974): 467.

<sup>1</sup>The versions tend to identify the subject of וַיֹּאמֶר ("then he said") explicitly either as Moses or as Yahweh himself. Contextually, Moses is the subject.

<sup>2</sup>The pronoun הוּא could conceivably be the subject of וַיֹּאמֶר. However, a pronoun is rarely used as the subject of the verb אָמַר. Accordingly, this translation reflects the LXX's understanding of the verse by reading הוּא as the first word of Moses' speech and the relative clause אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה as its nominal complement.

ויאמר משה אכלתו היום כִּי־שבת היום ליהוה היום לא תמצאוהו בשדה: ששת ימים  
תלקטוהו וביום השביעי שבת לא יהיה־בו

- 25 Then Moses said to them, "Eat [the food] today, because today [is] a Sabbath to Yahweh. Today you will not find it in the field.  
26 Six days shall you gather it, but on the seventh day is a Sabbath. There shall not be any on it.

Exod 16:27 reports the people's disobedience to this further instruction and vss. 28-30 report the divine reproof for this disobedience and the people's final compliance to the divine instruction:

ויאמר יהוה אל־משה ער־אנה מאנכם לשמר מצותי ותורתי: ראו כִּי־הוה נתן לכם  
השבת על־כן הוא נתן לכם ביום הששי לחם יומים שבו איש תחתיו אל־יצא איש ממקמו  
ביום השביעי: וישבתו העם ביום השביעי

- 28 Then Yahweh said to Moses, "How long do you refuse to keep my commandments and my laws?  
29 "See, Yahweh has given you the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> Therefore on the sixth day he gives you bread for two days. Let each one stay in his place on the seventh day."<sup>2</sup>  
30 Then the people rested on the seventh day.

In support of the impermanence of the Sabbath, it is sometimes argued that Exod 16 pictures it as a new and previously unknown institution. In other words, it is argued that this chapter contains a limitation in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. It

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX has "this day" (τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην) instead of "the Sabbath."

<sup>2</sup>Or "on the Sabbath" (ביום השבת), as reflected in some versions.

has been noted that the first use "of the word 'Sabbath' in all the Bible appears here," and that "the anarthrous 'Sabbath' of Exodus 16:23, 25 also brings out the 'newness' of the command."<sup>1</sup> However, these facts may simply point to the "newness" of the designation "Sabbath" rather than to the "newness" of the sanctity of the seventh day per se.<sup>2</sup> In fact, a good case can be made that Exod 16 portrays the restoration rather than the institution of the Sabbath. For example, in contrast to the detailed explanation of Passover in Exod 12, no account is given in Exod 16 of the meaning of the Sabbath or the reasons for keeping it, suggesting that the Israelites have some prior knowledge of it.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Griffith, 63.

<sup>2</sup>See Nahum M. Sarna, Understanding Genesis, The Melton Research Center Series, The Heritage of Biblical Israel, vol. 1 (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), 20, 21.

<sup>3</sup>See Ford, 82; Hasel, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch," 27. The absence of an explanation for the Sabbath in Exod 16 is not surprising, if one accepts Tsevat's hypothesis that the "intrinsic and basic meaning of the sabbath institution" is merely to stress "the divine sovereignty over time." Matitiah Tsevat, "The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath," ZAW 84 (1972): 454, 455. However, on Tsevat's own admission, this hypothesis necessarily involves a dramatic downplaying of the rationales for the Sabbath offered elsewhere in the Old Testament, e.g., "respite from work, the creation of the world, or the Exodus from Egypt." Ibid., 454.

Hasel argues that in Exod 16 "the didactic character of this narrative is obvious throughout. The wilderness generation was to learn to rest on the seventh day (verse 30). They were taught to be obedient to their Lord, to keep His 'commandments' (*mišwōt*) and His 'laws' (*tôrōt*). Does this imply that Israel had known 'laws and commandments' even before Sinai? Was there a Sabbath

Exod 16:1, 2 places the observance of the Sabbath in the wilderness before the erection of the tabernacle.<sup>1</sup>

---

commandment known before Sinai? The present form of Exodus 16 appears to hint in that direction. . . . If this be the case, nothing is revealed about the origin of such a divine law or instruction. It is assumed to exist." Hasel, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch," 26, 27. However, if "laws and commandments" are understood as comprising an ongoing body of revelation, their existence before the giving of the manna need not imply the prior existence of the Sabbath. See above, p. 49, n. 3. Instead, the people's Sabbath-breaking may simply be the most recent example of their ongoing disobedience. For example, note the record of their complaining in Exod 14:11, 12, and of their grumbling of Exod 15:24 and 16:2. Ezek 20:4-10 mentions Israel's willful idolatry in Egypt itself. For more information see Griffith, 63.

<sup>1</sup>Cassuto objects to the possibility of a reference to the Sabbath before Sinai, claiming that this narrative, "when it formed part of the pre-Torah tradition, was an isolated and independent story—one of the many tales dealing with incidents of the desert—and belonged to the period subsequent to the Revelation at Mount Sinai." Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Exodus, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), 188. Accordingly he argues that Exod 16 is placed in its present position, not on the basis of chronology, but "on the basis of . . . both thematic and verbal association." Ibid., 187. However, Cassuto's proposal does little to inform the understanding of the final form of the text, since he proceeds to argue that the passage has now been formulated so that the alleged "difficulty arising from the fact that the Sabbath is mentioned prior to the story of the Decalogue" is greatly eased. Ibid., 190.

Cassuto objects that the use of the expression "before Yahweh" (לפני יהוה) in Exod 16:9 points to a time after the tabernacle has been built. Ibid., 186. However, there is no reason why the expression "before the Lord" in Exod 16:9 should presuppose the existence of the tabernacle any more than in Exod 6:12, 30, where the tabernacle is clearly not in existence. More pertinent is his objection that the use of the expression "before the Testimony" (לפני העדות) in vs. 34 presupposes the existence of the tabernacle. Ibid., 186. However, there is also no indication in the text itself that Exod 16:32-36 refers to the same time period as the rest of the chapter. Instead, it seems to be a parenthetical addition to the narrative,

It thus affirms that the Sabbath is an institution that exists independently of either land or temple, and thus that it contains a lack of geographic limitation in terms of the fourth criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In conclusion, Exod 16 does not present the Sabbath as a new and previously unknown institution. Instead, a good case can be made that it portrays the restoration rather than the institution of the Sabbath. It also affirms the applicability of the Sabbath outside the land and in the absence of the sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

#### Exod 20:8-11

The Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:8-11 stands at the heart of the Exodus account of the Decalogue:

זכור אחרים השבת לקרשו ששת ימים תעבר ועשית כל-מלאכתך ויום השביעי שבת  
 ליהוה אלהיך לא תעשה כל-מלאכה אתה ובנך-זבחת עבדך ואמתך ובהמתך ונרך אשר  
 בשעריך כי ששת-ימים עשה יהוה את-השמים ואת-הארץ את-הים ואת-כל-אשר בם ויניח  
 ביום השביעי על-כן ברך יהוה אחרים השבת ויקרשהו

---

which is clearly written from the perspective of settlement in the land of Canaan (vs. 35).

<sup>1</sup>Griffith, 64, 65, sees evidence of the restriction of the Sabbath to Israel, in the claim that Yahweh "has given you the Sabbath" (Exod 16:29). However, it is only to be expected that Israel should be commanded to observe the sacred times. Instead, what is critical for this study is evidence that the obligation to observe a sacred time is either restricted to Israel or extends beyond it. See above, p. 61. Exod 16 simply does not address this issue.



- 8 Remember<sup>1</sup> the Sabbath day by sanctifying it.  
 9 Six days you may serve and do all your work.  
 10 However, the seventh day<sup>2</sup> [is] a Sabbath to Yahweh  
 your God. You shall not do any work:<sup>3</sup> [not] you,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Deut 5:12 when it substitutes the root שָׁמַר ("keep") for the root זָכַר. It also clearly uses the imperative form, whereas the Massoretic reading זָכַר is clearly an infinitive absolute. See Waltke and O'Connor, 593. On the other hand, the unpointed form זָכַר may simply be a plene spelling of the imperative from which the ך has not been removed.

Whether זָכַר is pointed as an imperative or an infinitive absolute, the meaning is much the same, since the infinitive absolute is traditionally understood as an emphatic imperative. E.g., see Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 346.

The infinitive absolute may also be used as an "adverbial infinitive or complement," qualifying "the situation represented by the finite verb" by describing "the manner or the attendant circumstance of that situation." Waltke and O'Connor, 588. See also Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 341; Joüon, 427. Accordingly, Watts argues that in Exod 20:8 the word זָכַר "should properly be translated with a kind of gerundive force, giving it an introductory character calling attention to the Sabbath day which is otherwise not mentioned until the end of the commandment. The translation in Ex 20:8-9 [sic; should be 8-10] should then read, 'Remembering the sabbath day to hallow it, six days you shall labour and to [sic; should be do] all your work. But the seventh day is a sabbath to Yahweh, your God.'" John D. W. Watts, "Infinitive Absolute as Imperative," ZAW 74 (1962): 144. See also Griffith, 75. However, the Sabbath is mentioned in vs. 9, as Watts's own translation shows. In addition, the seventh day is specifically contrasted with the six days of work, as shown by Watt's use of the adversative "but." Accordingly, it is unlikely that remembering the Sabbath day would be the attendant circumstance of the command to work for the six days.

<sup>2</sup>The Papyrus Nash and some LXX and Vulgate manuscripts clearly read . . . וּבַיּוֹם ("However, on the seventh day") rather than . . . וַיּוֹם ("However, the seventh day").

<sup>3</sup>The Papyrus Nash, LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate clearly read the prepositional phrase בָּהּ ("on it") after לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה

or your son, or your daughter; your male slave, or your female servant, or your cattle, or your alien who [is] within your gates.<sup>1</sup>

- 11 Because in six days Yahweh made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that [is] in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore Yahweh blessed the Sabbath day<sup>2</sup> and sanctified it.

Exod 20:8-11 provides *prima facie* support for the permanence of the Sabbath in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. It has been argued that according to Exod 20:11, the Sabbath is first

---

("you must not do").

<sup>1</sup>A translation of the connective waw before עבדך ("your male servant") is clearly omitted by some versions, and the waw before בהמותך ("your cattle") is omitted in the Samaritan Pentateuch, in order to make the use or nonuse of the waw more consistent throughout this listing. So also with the evident addition of the waw before את הים ("the sea") in the reading of the manuscripts of many versions in vs. 11.

The LXX has ὁ παροῦς ἐν σοί ("the alien among you") instead of נרך אשר בשעריך ("your stranger who [is] within your gates"). However, "the gate" in the Pentateuch is a synecdoche for the "the town," and after the settlement virtually all people lived in the cities, or in the villages belonging to them. E.g., see C. C. McCown, "City," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (1962), 1:633, and B. S. Easton and Ralph W. Vunderink, "Gate," ISBE, rev. ed. (1982), 2:408. Accordingly, both expressions simply denote the alien living in the Israelite community.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX and the Syriac clearly read את יום השביעי ("the seventh day") instead of את יום השבת ("the Sabbath day").

blessed at Sinai.<sup>1</sup> However, in context the use of the Piel perfect of בָּרַךְ indicates a blessing of the Sabbath prior to Sinai, i.e., at the time of creation itself.<sup>2</sup> Likewise, Griffith separates the issue of God's creation rest "as a motivation to obey the Sabbath" from the issue of his creation rest as "the origin of the Sabbath."<sup>3</sup> However, it is an artificial contrivance to separate the origin of any institution from the event it is meant to memorialize.<sup>4</sup> Exod 20:8-11 thus presents the Sabbath as a creation ordinance just as Gen 2:1-3 does.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Harold H. P. Dressler, "The Sabbath in the Old Testament," in From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: 1982), 29; Griffith, 33.

<sup>2</sup>See Gen 2:3. "Note the tenses employed in Exodus 20:11: 'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth . . . and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.' All four verbs are in the past tense. No one disputes that the first two apply to Creation week. The correlation of divine acts as here portrayed clearly indicates that the blessing and the hallowing took place at the same time as the resting." Ford, 79, 80, ellipsis his.

<sup>3</sup>Griffith, 27.

<sup>4</sup>"There is no instance in Scripture of a memorial being instituted millenniums [sic] after the event it is to memorialize. . . . The Passover, for example, began at the time of the deliverance it symbolized, and the twelve memorial stones in Jordan and the twelve on the bank were erected on the occasion of the miraculous crossing. The situation is the same with the Lord's Supper." Ford, 81.

<sup>5</sup>Hasel, "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch," 30, notes that "the Hebrew root *zkr* [remember] has retrospective and prospective aspects," and argues that in Exod 20:8, the retrospective aspect indicates a belief in the existence of the Sabbath prior to Sinai. However, the root זָכַר sometimes

Exod 20:10 extends the Sabbath rest to the גֵּר or alien, and so it apparently contains no limitation in terms of the third criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. However, two major arguments have been raised to obviate the universalistic implications of this extension.

First, rabbinic Judaism has traditionally identified the גֵּר of Exod 20:10 with the ger saddiq, the circumcised "righteous alien," rather than with the ger toshab, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien" who is a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion.<sup>1</sup> Such a distinction should not be dismissed a priori, for the term גֵּר is sometimes used specifically with reference to the circumcised alien.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, from the context of Exod 23:12 and the content of Deut 5:14, 15, it is clear that no distinction can be drawn

---

has an exclusively prospective aspect. "According to Isa. 47:7, Babylon should have remembered its end. A man should remember the coming 'days of darkness' (Eccl. 11:8)." Roland E. Clements, "זָכָר zākhār," TDOT (1980), 4:67. Accordingly, the argument that Exod 20:8-11 presents the Sabbath as existing before Sinai should not be based on the use of the verb זָכָר alone.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., b. Yoma 28b; Mekilta Exod 20:10; Pesikta Rabbati 23.4. For more information, see Moore, 1:339, 340.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see below, p. 167.

between the circumcised and the uncircumcised alien in any discussion of the obligation to observe the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup>

Second, John Calvin accepts that the word **גֵּר** in Exod 20:10 includes uncircumcised aliens. However, he adds that they and the domestic animals are included

not for their sakes, but lest anything opposed to the Sabbath should happen beneath the eyes of the Israelites. . . . Besides, if the very least liberty had been conceded to them [the Israelites], they would have done many things to evade the Law in their days of rest, by employing strangers and the cattle in their work.<sup>2</sup>

This argument is based on an artificial distinction between nature and grace. It is also clear from Exod 23:12 and Deut 5:14 that the provision for the alien to rest is a central rather than an incidental purpose of the Sabbath.<sup>3</sup>

In conclusion, Exod 20:8-11 stresses the universal dimensions of the Sabbath by presenting it as a creation ordinance and by extending of the Sabbath rest to the **גֵּר** or alien.

#### Exod 23:12

"The six-years seventh year-scheme" of the Sabbatical Year in Exod 23:10, 11, furnishes "a

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see below, pp. 127, 149.

<sup>2</sup>John Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony, trans. Charles William Bingham, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950), 439. For more information, see Augsburg, "Calvin and the Mosaic Law," 1:280.

<sup>3</sup>See below, pp. 127, 129.

stichwortliche [sic; should be stichwörtliche] association for the six days-seventh day contrast" of vs. 12:<sup>1</sup>

ששת ימים תעשה מעשיך וביום השביעי תשבת למען ינוח שורך וחמורך וינפש בך  
אמך והגר

Six days you must do your work, but on the seventh day you must stop, so that your ox and your donkey may stop, and the son of your female servant<sup>2</sup> and the stranger may be refreshed.

Like Exod 20:10, Exod 23:12 extends the Sabbath rest to the גר or alien, and so it apparently contains no limitation in terms of the third criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. In fact, the special relevance of Exod 23:12 becomes clear in the way it clarifies the two issues that remain unsettled in Exod 20:10, i.e., whether the obligation to observe the Sabbath includes the uncircumcised גר, and if it does, whether the inclusion is incidental or primary to the purpose of the Sabbath.<sup>3</sup>

First, the inclusion of the uncircumcised גר is suggested by the fact that nearby in Exod 23:9, the term גר

---

<sup>1</sup>Kiker, 90.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Deut 5:14 when it has עבדך ועמתך כמוך וכל בהמתך, leading to the translation, "so that your male servant and your female servant may rest like you, and all your cattle."

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 125.

clearly includes all aliens, circumcised and uncircumcised alike:

וְגֵר לֹא תִלְחֹץ וְאַתָּם יָדַעְתֶּם אֶת־נַפְשׁ הַגֵּר כִּי־גֵרִים הָיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם

You must not oppress the alien.<sup>1</sup> You know the soul of the alien, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.

Clearly, the designation of the Israelites as גֵּרִים or "aliens" in Egypt implies their vulnerable position there as a dependent minority, rather than anything about their religious practice.<sup>2</sup> Conversely, the command not to oppress the גֵּר or alien has all aliens in view, and not just those who adopt the Israelite covenant by being circumcised.

Second, the inclusion of the גֵּר in the Sabbath rest of Exod 23:12 is a primary rather than an incidental purpose of the Sabbath. Indeed, the text does not even mention the benefits of the Sabbath rest for "the addressee

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX, the Syriac, and some Targums, assimilates to the use of the plural יָדַעְתֶּם ("you know") in the next clause when it reads לֹא תִלְחֹצוּ ("you must not oppress"—plural) instead of לֹא תִלְחֹץ ("you must not oppress"—singular).

<sup>2</sup>The LXX translation of גֵּרִים in the last clause of Exod 23:9 as προσήλυτοι ("for you were proselytes in the land of Egypt") is clearly inappropriate, although consistent with its translation of גֵּר/גֵּרִים in Exod 23:9, 10. It would be more appropriate if גֵּר were translated more literally as πάροικος ("sojourner") in both verses. See van Houten, 181.

and his family."<sup>1</sup> Instead, the addressee is to rest expressly "so that" (למען) his animals may rest, and so that the son of his female servant and the alien may be refreshed.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, the universalistic implications of the inclusion of the נ in the Sabbath rest of Exod 20:10

---

<sup>1</sup>Dale Patrick, Old Testament Law (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1985), 92.

<sup>2</sup>This fact does not mean that no benefit for the addressees of the command is envisaged at all, nor that a worship value of the Sabbath is being denied. Instead, it simply suggests that the Sabbath is here portrayed as having a distinct humanitarian purpose. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, vol. 2, BC, trans. James Martin, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, fourth series, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872), 146, point out that Exod 23:10-18 is not a single unit, but that Exod 23:1-12 is a list of משמטי outlining humanitarian obligations, and that vss. 14-19 constitute a list of משמטי outlining Israel's festal obligations before Yahweh, with vs. 13 forming a boundary between the two. They then argue that this structure may explain why in Exod 23:10-12 "there is no allusion to the keeping of a sabbath unto the Lord . . . in connection with either the seventh year or seventh day," such as may be found in Exod 20:10 and Lev 24:2. Ibid. This structure would also explain the absence of any mention of benefits for the addressees of the command. For more information see Cassuto, Exodus, 301; R. Alan Cole, Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), 178, 179.

Noth, 190, argues that the welfare of animals, slaves, and aliens is not primarily in focus in Exod 23:12. Instead, a sacral "'return to the original state', a *restitutio in integrum*" is in view, and they are to rest simply because "they are an integral part of the creation which . . . is to return to its 'rest'." Ibid. However, such a conclusion is not drawn from the passage itself. See Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 135; Jay W. Marshall, Israel and the Book of the Covenant: An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Law, SBLDS, no. 140 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 159.



are further elaborated by the context and content of Exod 23:12, which respectively make it clear that circumcised and uncircumcised aliens alike are in view, and that the inclusion of the נִי is a primary rather than an incidental purpose of the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup>

#### Exod 31:12-17

The seventh and last of the divine speeches about the building of the tabernacle in Exod 25-31 is found in Exod 31:12-17, even though it says "nothing directly about a place of worship or about the cult itself."<sup>2</sup> This passage presents the Sabbath both in relationship to creation and in relationship to Yahweh's sanctification of Israel:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר: וְאַתָּה דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאַתָּה שַׁבָּתְתָהּ  
 כִּי אוֹת הוּא בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם לֵדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם: וְשַׁמְרַתֶּם אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת כִּי  
 קָדֵשׁ הוּא לָכֶם מִחֻלְלֵיהָ מוֹת יוּמָת כִּי כָל־הַעֲשֹׂה בָּהּ מְלָאכָה וְנִכְרַתָּה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מִקִּרְבִּי  
 עֲמִיהָ: שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים יַעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת שַׁבְתוֹן קָדֵשׁ לִיהוָה כָּל־הַעֲשֹׂה  
 מְלָאכָה בַּיּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת מוֹת יוּמָת: וְשַׁמְרֻ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת לְדֹרֹתָם  
 בְּרִית עוֹלָם: בֵּינִי וּבֵין בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אוֹת הוּא לַעֲלֹם כִּי־שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־  
 הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּת וַיִּנָּחֵשׁ

12 And Yahweh said to Moses,

13 "As for you, speak to the Children of Israel, saying, 'Surely you must keep my Sabbaths, for it [is] a sign between me and you throughout your

---

<sup>1</sup>On the significance of the inclusion of the Sabbath in the Decalogue as an argument for its perpetuity, see above, pp. 76-81.

<sup>2</sup>Peter J. Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40," ZAW 89 (1977): 375.

- generations, for [you] to know that I, Yahweh, sanctify you.<sup>1</sup>
- 14 You must keep the Sabbath for it is holy to you. Anyone who profanes it shall surely be put to death, for as for any one who does work on it, that person shall be cut off from the midst of his people.<sup>2</sup>
- 15 For six days work may be done,<sup>3</sup> but on the seventh day [is] a solemn Sabbath, holy to Yahweh. Any one who does work on the Sabbath day shall surely be put to death.
- 16 The Children of Israel must keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath<sup>4</sup> throughout their generations [as] an enduring covenant.
- 17 Between me and the Children of Israel, it [is] a sign indefinitely, for in six days Yahweh made the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum clearly reads **מקדשם** ("do sanctify them") instead of **מקדשכם** ("sanctify you").

<sup>2</sup>Some Syriac and Targum manuscripts evidently read **מעמו** ("from his people") instead of **מקרב עמו** ("from the midst of his people").

<sup>3</sup>In an assimilation to Exod 20:9, the LXX clearly reads the Qal imperfect second person masculine singular **תעשה** ("you [singular] may do"), while the Syriac and Vulgate clearly read the Qal imperfect second person masculine plural **תעשו** ("you [plural] may do") instead of the Niphal third person masculine form **יעשה** ("may be done"), as in the Massoretic Text. In the Massoretic text, the masculine verb form **יעשה** is discordant with the feminine subject **מלאכה** ("work"). However, it must be remembered that "gender agreement may . . . lapse when . . . the verb precedes the subject; the subject may be feminine singular . . . and the verb may be masculine singular." Waltke and O'Connor, 109. See also *ibid.*, 110, and Deut 32:35; 1 Kgs 22:36; Isa 9:18.

<sup>4</sup>The LXX, followed by the Vulgate, adds **αὐτά** ("these things") but omits any translation of **את השבת** ("the Sabbath").

heavens and the earth,<sup>1</sup> but on the seventh day he stopped and was refreshed.'"

Like Exod 20:11, Exod 31:17 pictures the weekly Sabbath as a creation ordinance, and so provides prima facie support for its permanence in terms of the second criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.<sup>2</sup>

Exod 31:12-17 explicitly identifies the Sabbath as a sign between Yahweh and Israel, and thus it has been claimed that this passage contains a limitation here in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns

---

<sup>1</sup>In an assimilation to Exod 20:11, the minor LXX codex 426 adds **καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς** ("and the sea and all that is in them"). This reading is reflected in the Syriac.

<sup>2</sup>Note the use of perfect and imperfect consecutive verb forms in Exod 31:17 just as in Exod 20:11. In fact, Exod 31:17 probably provides more evidence of the status of the Sabbath as a creation ordinance than does Exod 20:11. Sometimes it is claimed that creation provides only the pattern and not the reason for Sabbath observance. E.g., see Congdon, 141, 142. The artificiality of this distinction has been recognized by some antisabbatarians themselves. E.g., see Griffith, 69, n. 7. However, its weakness is particularly clear in Exod 31:17, because here the "creation Sabbath . . . is severed from its natural context [after vs. 15a] and placed at the end of the passage." Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 201. Accordingly, it functions not only as a pattern for Sabbath observance, but also "serves as a fundamental Sabbath tradition on the basis of which a comprehensive Sabbath theology may rest." Ibid.

the identity of those who observe it.<sup>1</sup> However, the evidence does not support this claim.

In Exod 31:12-17, the Sabbath is said to be a sign between Yahweh and Israel, so that Israel will know that it is Yahweh who "sanctifies" them (vs. 13), the Piel masculine singular participle of קָדַשׁ being used with a second person masculine plural suffix. The Piel stem of קָדַשׁ is employed with a personal object in a number of ways: to depict the consecration of the firstborn male (Exod 31:2); the preparation of the people for the theophany on Mount Sinai (Exod 19:10); the preparation of Jesse and his sons for a sacrificial meal (1 Sam 16:5); the gathering of people together for fasting (Joel 2:16); and the preparation of people for war (Josh 7:13; Jer 51:27, 28).<sup>2</sup> However, its major use is in the context of the consecration of priests to their office and duties.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, it might be concluded that in Exod 31:13 a ritual boundary is also in view.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Griffith, 87.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Exod 28:3, 41; 29:1, 33, 44; 30:30; Lev 8:12, 30; 21:8; 1 Sam 7:1; Ezek 44:19; 46:20. For a listing of the occurrences of the Piel stem of קָדַשׁ in the Old Testament, see Wigram, 1090.

<sup>3</sup>Exod 28:3; 29:1, 44; 30:30; 40:13; Lev 8:12, 30; 21:8.

<sup>4</sup>On the concept of ritual boundary, see above, p. 82.

Against this conclusion, Lev 20:8 stresses the importance of the statutes in vss. 2-21 with the same affirmation as Exod 31:13, **אני יהוה מקדשכם** ("I, Yahweh, sanctify you"). The specific penalties attached to some of these statutes may be distinctive to the theocratic period. However, there is a universal dimension evident in Lev 20:23, where it is stated that the present occupants of the land are about to be expelled precisely because they have followed the customs prohibited here. Clearly, in this case Yahweh's sanctification of Israel entails her careful observance of universally applicable norms. The fact that Exod 31:17 links the sign function of the Sabbath to the universal theme of creation suggests that a universally applicable norm is involved here too.

The Sabbath commandment in Exod 31:12-17 comes at the conclusion of the instructions for building the tabernacle, starting in Exod 25. It is thus emphasized that the Sabbath is still to be observed, even during the press of activity surrounding the building of the tabernacle.<sup>1</sup> This passage presents the Sabbath as an institution that stands independent of the possession of both land and temple. Exod 31:12-17 thus contains no limitations in terms of the fourth criterion used in this

---

<sup>1</sup>Cassuto, Exodus, 404; Noth, 241; Walter C. Kaiser, "Exodus," EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs., 1990), 2:374.

dissertation: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, Exod 31:12-17 pictures the Sabbath as a creation ordinance. It describes it as a sign between Yahweh and Israel that he sanctifies them, but this fact of itself does not indicate whether it is a ritual boundary or a universally applicable norm. However, the fact that vs. 17 links the sign function of the Sabbath to the universal theme of creation suggests the second option. Exodus 31:12-17 also pictures it as an institution which continues to function independently of the possession of either land or temple.

#### Exod 34:21

Between the command to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 34:18-20 and the command to

---

<sup>1</sup>It has been argued that the seven divine speeches in Exod 25-31 correspond to the seven successive days of creation in Gen 1:1-2:3, and that accordingly the tabernacle is pictured as a new creation. E.g., Kearney, 376-378; Jon D. Levenson, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985), 142-145; James B. Jordan, The Tabernacle: A New Creation, Biblical Horizons Occasional Paper, no. 5 (Tyler TX: Biblical Horizons, 1989), 3-8. See also below, p. 74. Accordingly, Wallace, 245, 246, contends that Exod 31:12-17 presents the Sabbath as a functional equivalent of the sanctuary, just like Gen 2:1-3 does. See above, pp. 114-116. However, at this point Wallace goes beyond the evidence, for in Exod 31:12-17, the point is not that the Sabbath replaces the tabernacle, but that the Sabbath now celebrates the sanctuary as a new creation, just as it celebrates the original creation of Eden.

observe the Feast of Weeks and Ingathering in vs. 22 comes the command to rest on the seventh day in vs. 21:

ששת ימים תעבד וביום השביעי תשבת בחריש ובקציר תשבת

Six days you may serve, but on the seventh day you must stop. In the [time of] plowing and in the [time of] harvest, you must stop.

This command is a reminder that the press of activity surrounding the Feasts of Weeks and Ingathering is not grounds for suspending the observance of the weekly Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> It is thus the agricultural counterpart of Exod 31:14, 15—which affirms the sanctity of the Sabbath while the tabernacle is being built—rather than a restriction of the obligation to observe the Sabbath to an agricultural setting. Accordingly, this verse does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Sabbath is permanent or temporary.

#### Exod 35:1-3

Just as the instructions given to Moses for building the tabernacle in Exod 25-31 are followed by the Sabbath commandment of Exod 31:12-17, so the instructions

---

<sup>1</sup>Cassuto, Exodus, 445; Noth, 264; Cole, 321. Kiker, 80, argues that Exod 34:21 refers to the last day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, rather than to the weekly Sabbath. However, the reference to "plowing time" and "harvest" is best read as a merismus pointing to a perpetual order of seventh-day observance. See Mitchell Dahood, "Vocative Lamedh in Exodus 2, 14 and Merismus in 34, 21," Bib 62 (1981): 414.

for its erection given to the people in Exod 35-40 are preceded by the Sabbath commandment of Exod 35:1-3.<sup>1</sup>

ויקהל משה את־כל־עדת בני ישראל ויאמר אלהם אלה הדברים אשר צוה יהוה אתם: ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי יהיה לכם קדש שבת שבתון ליהוה כל־העשה בו מלאכה יומת: לא תבערו אש בכל משבתיכם ביום השבת

Moses summoned all the congregation of the Children of Israel together, and told them these things that Yahweh had commanded them: "Six days may work be done,<sup>2</sup> but on the seventh day you must have a holy time,<sup>3</sup> a most solemn Sabbath to Yahweh. Anyone who works on it must die. You must not kindle<sup>4</sup> a fire in any of your dwelling places on the Sabbath day."

As in Exod 31:14, 15, there is a stress in Exod 35:1-3 on the importance of observing the Sabbath amidst the press of activity entailed in the construction of the tabernacle.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, Exod 35:1-3 presents the Sabbath as an institution that exists independently of land or temple, and thus contains no geographic limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred

---

<sup>1</sup>Durham, 412.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan reading is the Niphal imperfect masculine singular form יַעֲשֶׂה. The LXX, followed by the Syriac, assimilates to Exod 20:10 when it apparently reads the Qal תַּעֲשֶׂה ("you may do").

<sup>3</sup>Literally, "but on the seventh day there shall be to you holiness."

<sup>4</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the Hiphil תִּבְעִירו rather than the Piel תִּבְעִרו of the Massoretic text.

<sup>5</sup>Cole, 234; Cassuto, Exodus, 454; Sailhamer, Pentateuch, 317.



time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>1</sup>

Lev 19:3, 30

Lev 19:3 ties in the obligation to keep the weekly Sabbath with the obligation to honor one's parents. Vs. 30 ties it in with the obligation to reverence the sanctuary. However, neither verse provides any criteria to establish whether the Sabbath is permanent or temporary.

Lev 23:2, 3

The listing of annual sacred times in Lev 23:4-38 is preceded by the affirmation of the importance of the weekly Sabbath in vss. 2, 3:

דבר אל־בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם מועדי יהוה אשר חקראו אתם מקראי קדש אלה הם  
מועדי: ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון מקרא־קדש כל מלאכה לא  
תעשו שבת הוע ליהוה בכל מושבתיכם

---

<sup>1</sup>In the wilderness context, the prohibition against lighting a fire could be part of the prohibition against cooking food on the Sabbath in Exod 16:24, although it may also "have been intended here to prohibit making a fire for the metalworking involved in constructing the Tabernacle and its furniture." J. P. Hyatt, Exodus, rev. softback ed., NCBC (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1980; London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Pub., 1980), 329. In either case, this specific prohibition appears to be an example of the general prohibition against Sabbath work. Accordingly, it would not be directed against lighting a fire for other purposes, such as warmth in colder climates. See SDABC, 1:679. Instead, it might simply be an example of a timebound formulation of what is still a timeless law. See above, p. 63, n. 2.

- 2 Speak to the Children of Israel and say to them,  
 "The festivals of Yahweh that you must proclaim as  
 holy times,<sup>1</sup> these [are] my festivals.  
 3 Six days may work be done,<sup>2</sup> but on the seventh day  
 [is] a most solemn Sabbath.<sup>3</sup> You must not do any  
 work. It [is] a Sabbath to Yahweh in all your  
 dwelling places."

In Lev 23:2, 3 the Sabbath seems to be listed as  
 one of the **מועדי יהוה** or "festivals of Yahweh," even though in  
 Lev 23:37, 38, these festivals are clearly distinguished  
 from the **שבתות יהוה** or "Sabbaths of Yahweh."<sup>4</sup> Likewise, vs.  
 4 virtually repeats the heading of vs. 2. Accordingly, it  
 has been argued that Lev 23:2, 3, is "a later addition,  
 intended to give weight to the growth in importance of the  
 sabbath that had come about during and after the exile."<sup>5</sup>  
 On the other hand, Kiker contends that

when the chapter is handled form critically . . .  
 indications of unity are found between verses 1-3 and

<sup>1</sup>The Targum reads the singular form, **מקרא קדש**, "holy time," in both vss. 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup>The textual variants here are the same as with the occurrence of **תעשה** in Exod 31:15, except that some LXX manuscripts have the plural active **ποιήσετε** rather than the singular active **ποιήσεις** ("you shall do"). The conclusions drawn in the context of Exod 31:15 also apply here. See above, p. 137, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup>In an assimilation to the use of **ליהוה** ("to Yahweh") later in Lev 23:3, the LXX here adds **τῷ κυρίῳ** ("to the Lord"). The Syriac clearly follows the same assimilation.

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup>Martin Noth, Leviticus: A Commentary, trans. J. E. Anderson, OTL (London: S.C.M. Press, 1965), 168.

the remainder of the chapter. . . . Indeed, the verses may have been intended as a preliminary section in which Stichwörter, around which the chapter was to be constructed, were introduced. . . . The festal calendar . . . of the Holiness code began with the introductory speech in Leviticus 23:1; the Sabbath regulation of verse 3 should not be excluded.<sup>1</sup>

Whatever the prehistory of the text, Hartley is correct in asserting that

the special vocabulary in this instruction on the Sabbath [Lev 23:3] gives additional evidence that it has been formulated for this speech, specifically the terms מלאכה, "work," שבת שבתון, "a sabbath of solemn rest," מקרא קדש, "a holy assembly," and בכל מושבתיכם, "in all your dwellings," because these terms are among the recurring terms in this speech. . . . This commandment on the Sabbath then has been made to fit this festal calendar and is an integral part of the speech's final formulation.<sup>2</sup>

The weekly Sabbath in Lev 23:2, 3 is thus set apart from the festal list of vss. 4-38, but at the same time is presented as a model upon which the others are based. Accordingly, both the differences and the similarities between vss. 2, 3 and vss. 4-36 should be carefully noted. In this context, it should be noted that there is no reference to an נדן or "generous gift" in connection with the weekly Sabbath, despite the references to it in vss. 8, 18, 25, 27, 36, and in the summary statement of vs. 37. It would be a mistake to argue that a noncultic observance of the weekly Sabbath is envisaged (Lev 24:8; Num 28:9, 10). On the other hand, in Lev 23:37, the reason for the

---

<sup>1</sup>Kiker, 110, 111.

<sup>2</sup>Hartley, 372.

proclamation of the annual מועדי יהוה ("festivals of Yahweh") as מקראי קדש ("holy times") is clearly to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice, and the obligation to observe these מקראי קדש as rest days would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the absence of any reference to the cultus in Lev 23:2, 3 indicates that in contrast to the situation with the annual festivals, the proclamation of the weekly Sabbath as holy time has validity quite apart from the cultic observances prescribed for it. These verses thus provide evidence for the perpetuity of the Sabbath in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

#### Lev 24:8

Lev 24:1-9 focuses on the holy place rather than on the Sabbath per se.<sup>2</sup> In vss. 2-4, the continual operation of the golden lampstand is discussed, and in vss. 5-9, the continued offering of "the bread of the presence" is commanded. Vss. 5, 6 detail the preparation of the bread, and vs. 7 commands that incense be set upon the two rows of

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>Wenham, Leviticus, 308.

bread as a food offering and memorial gift to Yahweh. The weekly Sabbath is referred to in vs. 8:

ביום השבת ביום השבת יערכנו לפני יהוה תמיד מאת בני־ישראל בריח עולם

Every Sabbath day<sup>1</sup> he must arrange it continually before Yahweh, an enduring covenant from<sup>2</sup> the Children of Israel.

Lev 24:9 commands that this bread be eaten by Aaron and his sons in the Holy Place.

Lev 24:8 clearly ties the Sabbath and the cultus together, and so it may present a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

Roy Gane has noted the links between the themes of the Sabbath, the sanctuary, and creation, and has argued that "the bread of the presence" points to Yahweh as the creator who continues to provide for his creation.<sup>3</sup> As "a

---

<sup>1</sup>Literally, "On the Sabbath day, on the Sabbath day," the repetition denoting entirety. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 395. The omission of the repetition in some Hebrew manuscripts, the LXX, and the Syriac is a case of haplography.

<sup>2</sup>The preposition מן here is perhaps used causally. See Waltke and O'Connor, 213. However, in view of the role of the Israelites in bringing the oil in vs. 2, it is more probable that it is used locationally, indicating "the place where a thing . . . originated." Ibid., 212. See also Hartley, 395.

<sup>3</sup>Gane, "Bread of the Presence," 179-203. See also above, pp. 114-116.

specific point of correspondence between the 'bread of the presence' ritual and creation," he notes that "YHWH enjoys the incense of the bread offering only at the end of each week, just as he enjoyed his rest at the end of the creation week."<sup>1</sup> Clearly the offering of "the bread of the presence" is a cultically rich act, in which Yahweh's continued providence and creation rest are celebrated. However, there is no suggestion that the obligation to observe the Sabbath per se is dependent upon this or any other sanctuary ritual.

#### Lev 26:2

Like Lev 19:30, Lev 26:2 ties in the obligation to keep the Sabbath with the obligation to reverence the sanctuary, but does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Sabbath is permanent or temporary.

#### Num 15:32-36

Num 15:22-29 prescribes offerings for unintentional sin, while vss. 30, 31, state that the person who deliberately breaks Yahweh's commandment will be cut off. Vss. 32-36 cite a specific example of deliberate disobedience and its penalty:

ויהיו בני־ישראל במדבר וימצאו איש מקשש עצים ביום השבת: ויקריבו אתו המצאים  
אתו מקשש עצים אל־משה ואל־אהרן ואל כל־העדה: ויניחו אתו במשמר כי לא פרש  
מה יעשה לו: ויאמר יהוה אל־משה מות יומת האיש רגום אתו באבנים כל־העדה מחוץ  
למחנה: ויציעו אתו כל־העדה אל־מחוץ למנה וירגמו אתו באבנים וימת כאשר צוה

---

<sup>1</sup>Gane, "Bread of the Presence," 201.

- 32 When the Children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man gathering pieces of wood on the Sabbath day.
- 33 Those who found him gathering pieces of wood brought him to Moses, Aaron, and the whole congregation.
- 34 They took him into custody, because [it was] not clear what should be done to him.
- 35 And Yahweh said to Moses, "He must certainly be put to death. All the congregation must stone<sup>1</sup> him with stones outside<sup>2</sup> the camp."
- 36 So the whole congregation brought him outside the camp and stoned him with stones, and he died, just as Yahweh had commanded Moses.

Like Exod 16; 31:14, 15; 35:1-3, Num 15:32-36 lacks any geographic limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance, because it presents the Sabbath as an institution that applies in the wilderness prior to Israel's possession of her land. This passage's prohibition against lighting fires on the Sabbath is parallel to that found in Exod 35:1-3.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In a transposition of consonants, the Samaritan Pentateuch has the imperative רָנְמוּ instead of the infinitive absolute רָנֵם. However, this transposition does not substantially alter the meaning of the text remains much the same.

<sup>2</sup>The addition of אל before מִחוּץ ("outside") in some manuscripts is an assimilation to the expression אל מִחוּץ in the next verse, Num 15:36.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 138, n. 1. In view of this parallel, "it is common to assert that the punishment for the Sabbath breaker was well known, and that it was only uncertainty about the mode of execution that caused the

Num 28:9, 10

Num 28:9, 10 prescribes the special burnt offering for each Sabbath. However, it does not clarify the issue of whether the Sabbath is for the offering or the offering for the Sabbath, and accordingly does not provide any criteria to establish whether it is permanent or temporary.

Deut 5:12-15

The Sabbath commandment in Deut 5:12-15 stands at the heart of the Deuteronomy account of the Decalogue:

שמור את־יום השבת לקרשו כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך ששת ימים העבד ועשית כל־מלאכתך: ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה אלהיך לא תעשה כל־מלאכה אתה ובנך ובכרך ועבדך ואמתך ושורך וחמרך וכל־בהמתך ונרך אשר בשאיך למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך כמורך: וזכרת כי־עבד היית בארץ מצרים ויצאך יהוה אלהיך משם ביד חזקה ובזרע נשויה על־כן צוך יהוה אלהיך לעשות את־יום השבת

- 12 Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, just as Yahweh your God has commanded you.
- 13 Six days you may serve and do all your work.
- 14 However, the seventh day<sup>1</sup> is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God. You must not do any work:<sup>2</sup> [not] you, or

---

people to keep the wood-gatherer in custody until further instructions could be received on the matter." Timothy R Ashley, The Book of Numbers, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1993), 291. However, it is "more likely that a deeper question was at issue: whether a man who was gathering sticks . . . on the Sabbath, presumably to make a fire in contravention of the law, was as guilty as if he had actually built the fire." Ibid.

<sup>1</sup>Some Massoretic manuscripts and the Papyrus Nash instead have . . . וּבְיוֹם ("but on the seventh day") rather than . . . וְיוֹם ("but the seventh day"). The Dead Sea Scrolls read . . . כִּי בְיוֹם ("for on the seventh day").

<sup>2</sup>After לא תעשה ("you must not do") Qumran and Papyrus Nash add ב(ו)ה, and the Samaritan Pentateuch adds בו ("on it"). The Pentateuch, Syriac, and Vulgate reflect



your son, or your daughter, or your male slave,<sup>1</sup> or your female servant, or your ox,<sup>2</sup> or your donkey, or any of your cattle, or your alien who [is] within your gates, so that your male servant and female servant may rest like you.

- 15 Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and that Yahweh your God brought you out from there with a strong hand and with an outstretched hand. Therefore Yahweh your God commanded you to observe the Sabbath day.<sup>3</sup>

While Yahweh's creation rest is the reason given for Sabbath observance in Exod 20:11,<sup>4</sup> the redemption of Israel is the reason given in Deut 5:15.<sup>5</sup> Jeffrey Siker-

---

these readings.

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, Qumran, the LXX, and the Vulgate assimilate to Exod 20:10 in the omission of the connective waw ("or") before עֶבֶד ("your slave").

<sup>2</sup>The connective waw ("or") before שֹׂרֶךְ ("your ox") is omitted at Qumran, and in the Papyrus Nash and the Samaritan Pentateuch. The LXX reflects this reading.

<sup>3</sup>The addition of καὶ ἀγιαξέιν αὐτήν ("and to sanctify it") in some LXX manuscripts is an assimilation to Exod 20:11.

<sup>4</sup>On the claim of Congdon, 141, 142, that creation in Exod 20:8-11 provides only the pattern and not the reason for Sabbath observance, see above, p. 132, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup>It has been argued that while Exod 20:11 has "an introductory 'for' (kf)," the reference to Israel's redemption in Deut 5:15b begins with the "conjunction 'and' and simply enlarges the command" in vs. 15a "to include remembrance of the Exodus on the sabbath." Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Festival and Freedom: A Study of an Old Testament Theme," Int 28 (1974): 284. Accordingly, while "Deuteronomy 5:15 makes remembrance of the exodus [sic] a part of sabbath observance, . . . it does not follow that the Exodus tradition of deliverance is the reason for the sabbath in this commandment." Ibid., 284, 285.

The major weakness in Andreasen's position is the inadequacy of his treatment of "therefore" (עַל־כֵּן) in Deut 5:15. He notes that vs. 15b "again returns the attention

Gieseler suggests that there is an irreconcilable tension between these two reasons, which must simply be allowed to stand.<sup>1</sup> However, a genuine attempt at a reasonable reconciliation should be made before discarding the task as too difficult.

Griffith argues that Deut 5:12-15 shows the Sabbath was given to Israel only after the Exodus.<sup>2</sup> In other words, he uses the passage as evidence for the non-perpetuity of the Sabbath in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. He argues that at creation God "blessed and set apart the [seventh] day for its future use as a day of rest and worship for Israel

---

to the opening command and implies by means of 'therefore' ('al-kēn) that some reason for it has been provided." Ibid., 284. He then adds that "this is probably by analogy of [sic; should be to] Exodus 20:8-11, for . . . no reason for the sabbath per se is really provided here." Ibid. However, Andreasen here assumes the point that he is trying to prove, and unnecessarily implies that Deut 5:12-15 as it stands cannot be interpreted as a single coherent whole. The evidence is best accounted for by seeing both a social and a salvation-historical motivation for Sabbath observance in Deut 5:15. See Martin Rose, 5. Mose, vol. 2, 5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34: Rahmenstücke zum Gesetzeskorpus, ZBAT, no. 5.2 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994), 431. Accordingly, in Deut 5:12-15, Israel's deliverance from slavery is both a prod to show kindness towards dependents and a reason for Sabbath observance by Israel.

<sup>1</sup>Jeffrey Siker-Gieseler, "The Theology of the Sabbath in the Old Testament: A Canonical Approach," Studia biblica et theologica 11 (1981): 9. See also Jaki, 38.

<sup>2</sup>Griffith, 76.

under the Law."<sup>1</sup> However, this explanation is not convincing.<sup>2</sup>

Craigie attempts to reconcile the differences between Deut 5:12-15 and Exod 20:8-11 in such a way that the universal applicability of the Sabbath is preserved:

To rest on the sabbath day was to remember that man, as a part of God's created order, was totally dependent on the creator. . . . The Exodus, too, was a type of creation and thus forms an analogy to the creation account in Genesis. The Exodus from Egypt marks in effect the creation of God's people as a nation, . . . and the memory of that event was also a reminder to the Israelites of their total dependence upon God.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, Exod 20:11 presents the Sabbath on the "cosmic" level of the biblical concept of covenant, while Deut 5:15 presents the same reality on the "historical" level of the covenant.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, Deut 5:15 presents a reason why Israel in particular should observe the Sabbath, without negating the universal motivation presented earlier in the canon in Exod 20:11.

Craigie's view is to be preferred over Griffith's or Siker-Gieseler's because it harmonizes the Exodus and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 33.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 112-114.

<sup>3</sup>Craigie, 157. See also C. M. Carmichael, The Ten Commandments, The Ninth Sacks Lecture Delivered on 25th May 1982 (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1983), 21, 22. Griffith, 78, 79, cites the passage from Craigie, apparently without realizing how it answers his own position that "Deuteronomy . . . provides evidence that the Sabbath was given only to Israel." Ibid., 76.

<sup>4</sup>Doukhan, Creation Story, 225, 226.

Deuteronomy accounts of the Sabbath commandment without resorting to artificiality.

Like Exod 20:10, Deut 5:14, 15 commands that the Israelite include the נִכְּחִי or alien in the celebration of the Sabbath rest, and so there seems to be no limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. It also clarifies the two issues that remain unsettled in Exod 20:10, i.e., whether the obligation to observe the Sabbath includes the uncircumcised נִכְּחִי, and if it does, whether the inclusion is incidental or primary to the purpose of the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> Deut 5:14 commands the Israelite and his household to rest, "so that your male servant and female servant may rest like you." Furthermore, "although only the male and female slave are mentioned in the clause stating the rationale, it seems clear that they represent the entire list of dependents mentioned earlier in the command."<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the extension of rest to the household, the alien, and the livestock is a primary purpose of the Sabbath. Likewise, there is no reminder in Deut 5:15 that the Israelites were aliens in Egypt, although this concept is as implicit here as is the idea of

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup>van Houten, 92.

the alien in the purpose clause of vs. 14. Deut 5:14 thus has both the circumcised and the uncircumcised alien in view.

In conclusion, in contrast to Exod 20:11, Deut 5:15 presents redemption rather than creation as a reason for Sabbath-keeping, but these two reasons turn out to be complementary rather than contradictory. Accordingly, there is nothing here to contradict the thesis that the canon pictures the weekly Sabbath as a creation ordinance. Like Exod 20:10, Deut 5:14, 15 extends the Sabbath rest to the נָר or alien. However, unlike Exod 20:10, these verses also make it clear that circumcised and uncircumcised aliens alike are in view, and that the inclusion of the נָר is primary rather than incidental to the purpose of the Sabbath.

#### The New Moon in Num 10:10; 28:11-15

Num 10:10; 28:11-15 are the only commandments about New Moon observance in the Pentateuch.

The divine speech about the silver trumpets in Num 10:2-10 concludes with reference to New Moon observance in vs. 10:

וביום שמחתכם ובמועריכם ובראשי חדשיכם ותקעתם בחצצרת על עליכם ועל  
זבחי שלמיכם והיו לכם לזכרון לפני אלהיכם אני יהוה אלהיכם

And on the day of your rejoicing,<sup>1</sup> and on your festivals, and on your first days of the month, you must make a loud noise with trumpets over your burnt offerings and your peace offerings, and they shall be a memorial for you before your God.<sup>2</sup> I [am] Yahweh your God.

Num 28:11-15 follows the prescription of the special burnt offering for the Sabbath burnt offering in Num 28:9, 10, and prescribes the special burnt offering to be offered on the first day of each month.

Elsewhere in the Old Testament, the New Moon is presented as a popular time for family gatherings (1 Sam 20:18-42), for consulting a prophet (2 Kgs 4:23), or as a time when commerce is restricted, just as on the Sabbath (Amos 8:5).<sup>3</sup> However, the Pentateuch largely ignores the New Moon, never commanding that Israel should rest on this day or celebrate it in any way, apart from the blowing of

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the plural שִׂמְחֻתְכֶם ("your rejoicings") instead of the singular שִׂמְחָתְכֶם ("your rejoicing").

<sup>2</sup>In a dittography with the closing clause of the verse, some Hebrew manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch add the tetragrammaton יהוה before the designation אֱלֹהֵיכֶם ("your God").

<sup>3</sup>Greenberg, 414; Wigram, 404. While the text is fragmented, The Temple Scroll 24.9, 10, also seems to prohibit all servile work ([בִּירָה] כֹּל מְלָאכָה ע) on the New Moon. On the other hand, it has been proposed that the speakers in Amos 8:5 cannot conduct business on the New Moon, not because of any general prohibition against commerce, but simply because "they were officers of the cult . . . who at other times were active in the market." Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 24A (New York: Doubleday, 1989), 805.

trumpets in Num 10:10 and the offering of additional sacrifices in Num 28:11-15.

In the absence of other evidence, the obligation to observe it would not be expected to continue in the absence of the sacrificial cult. It is thus not surprising that even for Judaism, the New Moon lost "some of its import with the destruction of the Temple and the end of the sacrifices," nor that "the liturgical impact of the day" has shrunk over the centuries until now "it hardly makes a ripple."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Num 10:10 and 28:11-15 contain a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Passover

##### Exod 12:1-13, 21-28, and 42-50

In the divine speech report of Exod 12:1-20, Moses and Aaron are given instructions for the observance of the first Passover (vss. 1-13) and for the future observance of

---

<sup>1</sup>Greenberg, 415. For more information, see above, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup>It has been argued that the sparsity of the Pentateuch's prescriptions for New Moon observance "cannot be accidental," but must instead "be a deliberate act of omission for a set purpose," namely, that of suppressing New Moon observance to a minimum in view of its heathen origins. M. H. Segal, The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship and Other Biblical Studies (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), 154, 155. However, the Pentateuch might then be expected to ignore it or to prohibit it.

the Festival of Unleavened Bread (vss. 14-20). In the command-obedience formula of vss. 21-28, the elders of the people are given instructions for Passover observance, and the people obey Yahweh's command. Vss. 29-41 record the falling of the last plague and the Israelites' departure from Egypt, and vs. 42 affirms the importance of the future observance of Passover. In the command-obedience formula of vss. 43-50, Moses and Aaron are given statutes regulating who is to observe the Passover, and the people once again comply with Yahweh's command.

Exod 12:42 clearly pictures the Exodus as the reason for the timing of Passover:

ליל שמרים הוא ליהוה להוציאם מארץ מצרים הוא-הלילה הזה ליהוה  
שמרים לכל-בני ישראל לדרתם

It [was] a night<sup>1</sup> of watching for Yahweh to bring them out of the land of Egypt. This night [is a time of] watching to Yahweh for all the Children of Israel throughout their generations.

Accordingly, a prima facie case exists that it is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch followed by the LXX has the more common word for "night," לילה, instead of ליל.

<sup>2</sup>In Exod 12:11, it is said of the Passover meal that "it is a Passover to Yahweh" (פסח הוא ליהוה). Accordingly, Cassuto, Exodus, 139, 140, concludes that before the Exodus, "passover was already an established and



Exod 12:43-49 specifically restricts the observance of the Passover to native Israelites and to circumcised aliens, and so contains a limitation in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.<sup>1</sup>

ויאמר יהוה אל־משה ואהרן זאת חקת הפסח כל־בן־נכר לא־יאכל בו: וכל־עבד איש מקנח־כסף ומלתה אתו או יאכל בו: תושב ושכיר לא־יאכל־בו: בבית אחד יאכל לא־ תוציא מן־הבית מן־הבשר חוצה ועצם לא תשבר־בו: כל־ערת ישראל יעשו אתו: וכי־ יגור אִתָּךְ גֵר ועשה פסח ליהוה המול לו כל־זכר ואז יקרב לעשתו והיה כאזרח הארץ וכל־עלל לא־יאכל בו: תורה אחת יהיה לאזרח ולגר הגר בתוכם

- 43 Yahweh said to Moses and to Aaron,<sup>2</sup> "This is the statute of the Passover. No foreigner may eat of it.  
44 As for a man's servant purchased with silver,<sup>3</sup> let him circumcise him, then he may eat of it.  
45 A sojourner or a hired hand may not eat of it.

---

previously-known term," which was then simply given "a new aspect and significance, and dedicated to the Lord." However, even if the idea of protective sacrifice is known long before Israel, it would be speculative to identify such a practice too closely with Israel's Passover.

<sup>1</sup>This restriction is especially understandable in view of the specific function of the Passover as a memorial of the "deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, for the Exodus is the event in which God delivered them and made them his own people. It was the act whereby they gained their identity as his chosen people—demarcated from all other peoples. . . . Because of its nature, it is not appropriate to invite those who do not share their common history, i.e., aliens." van Houten, 90.

<sup>2</sup>In a case of haplography, the preposition **אל** ("to") is omitted before the name **אהרן** ("Aaron") in some Massoretic manuscripts, as reflected in the renderings of the Syriac and Targum.

<sup>3</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has **כספו** ("his silver") instead of **כסף** ("silver").

- 46 It must be eaten in one house. You must not bring<sup>1</sup> any of the flesh from the house outside, and you must not break a bone on it.
- 47 All the congregation of Israel<sup>2</sup> must observe it.
- 48 As for any alien who dwells with you<sup>3</sup> and wants to observe a Passover to Yahweh, let his every male be circumcised, and then let him draw near to do it, and he will be like the native of the land. As for any male who is uncircumcised, he may not eat of it.
- 49 There must be one law for the native and for the alien who dwells among you."

The Egyptian Passover in Exod 12 does not presuppose the possession of the land or the operation of a central sanctuary and thus contains no geographic limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the versions, has **לֹא תוֹצִיאוּ** ("you must not bring out"—plural) instead of **לֹא תוֹצִיא** ("you must bring out"—singular) in harmony with the use of the plural **לֹא תִשְׁבֵּר** ("you must not break") later in the verse.

<sup>2</sup>Some manuscripts, followed by the LXX and the Vulgate, read **עֲרַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** ("the congregation of the Children of Israel") instead of **עֲרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל** ("the congregation of Israel").

<sup>3</sup>Some manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the versions, have **אִתְּכֶם** ("with you"—plural) rather than **אִתְּךָ** ("with you"—singular).

<sup>4</sup>On the issue of whether the command to eat unleavened bread in Exod 12:8 is dependent or independent of the offering of the Paschal lamb, see the discussion of Judaism's understanding of the link between Passover and the sacrificial system, below, p. 161, n. 1.

in Egypt, the Israelites had been a number of families under the suzerainty of a worldly power. After the Exodus and forming of the covenant at Sinai, Israel became a single nation, the family of God; thus the Passover became the act, symbolically speaking, of the one large family of God, celebrated in one place where the sanctuary or house of God was located.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Exod 12 by itself should not be used to rule out the possibility of geographical factors limiting the extent of the applicability of Passover in the future, since the absence of centralization in the Egyptian Passover may arise out of the peculiarities of the situation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Craigie, 242.

<sup>2</sup>Compare how Ramban, 144, argues that the command to "observe this thing" in Exod 12:24 "refers to the Passover-offering itself. . . . It does not refer to the putting [smearing] of the blood . . . since only in the Exodus were they commanded to do so." Vss. 22, 23, are thus seen as parenthetical to the main flow of the speech of vss. 21-27. In support of this position, "this thing" (את הדבר הזה) in vs. 24 is identified with "this observance" (את העברה הזאת) in vss. 25, 26, which in turn is identified with the actual Passover sacrifice (זבח פסח) in vs. 27. Judaism has also long considered the hasty eating, the girded loins, sandals on the feet, and staff in hand described in vs. 11 to be unique features of the first Passover. See M. H. Segal, 37.

Other texts on centralization that still need to be examined include Num 9:10, 13; Hos 9:1-6. See below, pp. 162, 288. On the issue of centralization in Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:16, see above, pp. 96-101.

At first sight, there seems to be a temporal and geographical limitation on the future observance of Passover in Exod 12:25, והיה כִּי־תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן יְהוָה, לָכֵן כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־הָעֲבֹדָה הַזֹּאת ("It shall come to pass when you enter the land that Yahweh shall give to you according to what he has said, that you must keep this observance"). However, in the context of the Pentateuch as a whole, this qualification is best understood as an expression of the divine intention that Israel should enter the promised land shortly after her departure from Egypt, rather than as a geographical restriction per se on the place of future

In conclusion, Exod 12:26, 27, pictures the Passover as being instituted as a specific memorial of the Exodus, and vss. 43-49 specifically restrict the observance of the Passover to native Israelites and to circumcised aliens. The Egyptian Passover clearly does not presuppose the possession of the land or the operation of a central sanctuary, although it may be unwise to extend this feature to future Passover observances on the basis of Exod 12 alone.

Exod 23:18

The list of sacred times in Exod 23:10-17 is supplemented in vs. 18 by prohibitions against eating Yahweh's sacrifice with leaven and against letting the fat of his Feast (חֲנוּךְ) remain until morning. However, whether this verse refers to Passover in particular or to sacrifice and pilgrim feasts (חֲנוּכִּים) in general,<sup>1</sup> these prohibitions do

---

Passover observances. E.g., see William Henry Green, The Hebrew Feasts in Their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses Concerning the Pentateuch, The Newton Lectures for 1885 (New York: Robert Carter Bros., 1885), 160.

Noth, Exodus, 97, identifies the אֹרֶץ הָאֲדָמָה ("native of the land") in Exod 12:48 with the Israelite living in the land of Palestine. However, in the context of Exod 12 as a whole, "the natives of the land" are "no doubt, Abraham's descendants who are here regarded as the true natives to the land of Canaan since it was assigned them by God some six hundred years prior to the Exodus." Kaiser, "Exodus," 374.

<sup>1</sup>In support of the former position, see Durham, 333, 334. In support of the latter position, see Kaiser, "Exodus," 445.

not provide any criteria to establish whether it is permanent or temporary.

Exod 34:25

The list of sacred times in Exod 34:18-24 is supplemented in vs. 25 by prohibitions against slaughtering the blood of Yahweh's sacrifice with leaven and against leaving the fat of the Passover remaining until morning. As in Exod 23:18, these prohibitions do not provide any criteria to establish whether it is permanent or temporary.

Lev 23:5

The calendar of annual sacred times in Lev 23 begins in vs. 5 by prescribing the date of Passover observance, but it does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Passover is permanent or temporary.

Num 9:1-14

In Num 8:5-26 the Levites are consecrated for service in the tabernacle, and the way is thus prepared for the first celebration of Passover since the Exodus from Egypt. Num 9:2, 3 contains the divine command to observe the Passover, and vss. 4, 5 record the compliance of Moses and the people with the command. Vss. 6-8 report how corpse contamination prevents some men from observing the Passover, and vss. 9-14 record a divine address permitting those who are unclean or away on a journey to observe it in the fourth month.

The third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the identity of those who observe a sacred time, and in terms of this criterion, it should be noted that Num 9:14 discusses the relationship of the נִר or alien to the Passover:

וכִּי־נִר אֲחֶכֶם נִר וַעֲשֵׂה פֶסַח לִיהוָה כַּחֲקַת הַפֶּסַח וּבְמִשְׁמַנֵּי כֵן יַעֲשֶׂה  
חֻקִּי אֶחָד יִהְיֶה לָּכֶם וּלְנִר וּלְאֻזְרַח הָאָרֶץ

And when an alien sojourns with you and observes Passover to Yahweh, according to the statute of the Passover and according to its judgment,<sup>1</sup> so must he do. There must be one law for you, for the alien and for the native of the land.

There is no direct indication here of whether the alien's participation in the Passover is voluntary or compulsory. However, the reference to "the statute of the Passover" and to "its judgment" suggests that the limitation of participation to the circumcised alien prescribed in Exod 12:43-49 applies here also.<sup>2</sup>

The fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance, and Num 9:1-14 has limitations relevant to this criterion in two ways.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the Syriac and the Vulgate, has the plural וּבְמִשְׁמַנֵּי ("and according to its judgments") rather than the singular וּבְמִשְׁמַנִּי ("and according to its judgment").

<sup>2</sup>Ashley, 181, 182.

First, in Num 9:6, 7, the idea of observing Passover stands in direct relationship with that of bringing the offering of Yahweh:

ויהי אנשים אשר היו טמאים לנפש אדם ולא יכלו לעשות הפסח ביום ההוא ויקרבו לפני משה ולפני אהרן ביום ההוא: ויאמרו האנשים ההמה אליו אנחנו טמאים לנפש אדם למה נרע לבלתי הקרב את קרבן יהוה במעדרו בתוך בני ישראל

- 6 And it came about<sup>1</sup> [that some] men<sup>2</sup> were unclean because of a human corpse, and they could not observe the Passover on that day.  
7 So they approached Moses and Aaron on that day and those men said to him, "We [are] unclean because of a human corpse. Why should we be prevented from bringing the offering of Yahweh at its appointed time<sup>3</sup> among the Children of Israel?"

In vs. 13, the severest penalty is announced against the one who fails to observe the Passover properly, precisely because he has not brought the offering of Yahweh at its appointed time:

והאיש אשר הוא טהור וברוך לא יהיה וחדל לעשות הפסח ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מעמיה כי קרבן יהוה לא הקריב במעדרו חטאי ישא האיש ההוא

But as for the man who is clean or not on a journey<sup>4</sup> and fails to observe the Passover, that person shall be

---

<sup>1</sup>Some manuscripts, followed by the LXX, clearly understand the noun אנשים ("men") to be the subject of the sentence, and so read the plural ויהי ("and they were") instead of ויהי ("and it came about").

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint instead has *οἱ ἄνδρες* ("the men"). See also the Targum.

<sup>3</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the plural מועריו ("its appointed times") rather than the singular מוערו ("its appointed time") here and in vss. 2, 3, 13.

<sup>4</sup>In an assimilation to Num 9:10, the LXX adds the adjective μακρᾷ (ἀν) ("distant").

cut off from his people because he has not brought the offering of Yahweh at its appointed time. That man must bear his sin.

The Passover in Num 9:1-14 clearly presupposes the sacrificial system.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>God's Festivals and Holy Days, 8, 9, specifically argues that the Passover was "not instituted for the purpose of the sacrifices as some have supposed." However, the inextricability of this link is well illustrated by the existential crisis precipitated when sacrificial offerings ended with the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.

Bloch, 137, notes that, in the wake of this disaster, "there was even a serious doubt whether the biblical obligation to eat matzah [Unleavened Bread] survived the destruction of the Temple. All that definitely remained was the negative injunction to refrain from eating chametz [anything leavened]." He then summarizes the brilliant reevaluation of the Seder offered by Rabban Gamliel II, that has enabled it to remain a moral force in the face of the struggle to survive in the wake of 70 CE. Ibid., 137-140. However, the question in the face of such a radical reevaluation is whether other radical reevaluations of Passover might not be equally valid in view of the eclipse of the sacrificial system.

Bloch, 140, 141, claims that rabbinic Judaism has generally separated the obligation to eat matzah from the Paschal sacrifice, arguing that while the command to eat unleavened bread may be incidental to the Paschal sacrifice in Exod 12:8, it is given an independent status in Exod 12:18. E.g., see b. Pesahim 120a contra Rabbi Ahi ben Jacob. On the other hand, in the light of vss. 19, 20, Exod 12:18 actually seems to be part and parcel of "the negative injunction to refrain from eating chametz," rather than to be a positive command to eat matzah. Bloch, 142. Accordingly, it is not surprising that Bloch should follow the alternate interpretation of Exod 12:8 offered by Nahmanides, according to which the commands to eat the lamb and to eat matzah both have independent status right in the immediate context of Exod 12:8 itself. See Ramban, 127, 128. Bloch attempts to bolster this interpretation on the basis of a comparison between the phraseology of Exod 12:8 and Num 9:11: "There is no mitzvah to eat matzah in Iyar, and chametz is not prohibited. The ritual of the second pesach [Passover], however, calls for the eating of the offering with matzah and bitter herbs. The latter are only incidental to the offering, and therefore the preposition al ("with") precedes both of them. On the other hand, in the first pesach there is an independent mitzvah of matzah



Second, the Passover in Num 9:1-14 is observed in the wilderness, and hence is not dependent upon Israel's possession of her land.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, when Num 9:10, 11 grants permission for those away on a distant journey to observe the Passover in the second month, a clear geographical limitation on the observance of this festival is implied, for priority is given to the sanctity of a holy place over the sanctity of the originally appointed time:

דבר אל-בני ישראל לאמר איש איש כיהוה-שמא לנפש או בדרך רחקה לכם או  
לדרכיכם ועשה פסח ליהוה בחדש: השני בארבעה עשר יום בין הערבים יעשו אותו על-  
מצות ומררים יאכלו

---

and the maror is incidental to the offering, and therefore the preposition *al* precedes only the *merorim* [bitter herbs]." Bloch, 142. Bloch here seems to place too much weight on what may simply be a stylistic variation between Exod 12:8 and Num 9:11. Bloch notes that "the rabbis could have dispensed with maror after the destruction of the Temple. But they retained it by rabbinic provision because its presence helped the overall objective of the post-Temple Seder." Ibid., 143. Likewise, Judaism's retention of the mitzvah of matzot is probably better based on rabbinic provision than on a strained exegesis of the text.

<sup>1</sup>Bloch, 105, claims that the Passover was not intended to be observed in the wilderness, presumably on the basis of Exod 12:25. However, this claim goes beyond the evidence of Exod 12:25 itself. See above, p. 156, n. 2. He argues that the Passover is commanded in Num 9:1-3 only because of "the golden calf incident, which constituted the first major breach of the covenant. The divine forgiveness of this serious violation, which was sealed by the new covenant (Exod. 34:10) had to be confirmed by a second declaration of faith on the part of the Jewish people. This was done again through the offering of the paschal lamb." Ibid. However, Bloch's argument seems forced and is not based on the plain sense of the text itself.

- 10 Speak to the Children of Israel, saying, "As for each person who is unclean on account of a corpse or [is] on a distant journey, among you or your generations, he may observe a Passover to Yahweh.
- 11 "In the second month on the fourteenth day between the evenings, let them observe [it]. Let them eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs."

In conclusion, Num 9:1-14 discusses the relationship of the <sup>7</sup> or alien to the Passover, but does not directly indicate whether or not the participating alien must be circumcised first. Passover observance is not pictured as depending on Israel's possession of her land, but a geographic limitation is implied in the provision for those away on a distant journey to observe the Passover in the second month. It is also pictured as dependent upon the continuation of the sacrificial system.

#### Num 28:16

The calendar of annual sacred times in Num 28-29 begins with a statement of the date of Passover observance in Num 28:16. However, like Lev 23:5, this verse does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Passover is permanent or temporary.

#### Deut 16:1, 2, 5-7

The command to observe Passover in Deut 16:1, 2, 5-7 is part of the list of festal prescriptions in Deut 16:1-17, and subsumes the discussion of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in vss. 3, 4, 8. Deut 16:1 states the time and place of the observance of Passover:

שמור את־חדש האביב ועשית מסח ליהוה אלהיך כי בחדש האביב הוציאך יהוה אלהיך  
ממצרים לילה

Keep the month of Abib and you must observe a Passover to Yahweh your God, for in the month of Abib, Yahweh your God brought you out<sup>1</sup> of Egypt by night.

Deut 16:1 confirms the Exodus from Egypt as the reason for the timing of the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, so here as in Exod 12 a *prima facie* case exists that this feast is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

The expression "the month of Abib" has clear agricultural connotations, designating the month when the ripe, soft ears of grain appear.<sup>2</sup> The fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance, and in terms of this criterion, it might be argued from Deut 16:1 that the Passover is dependent upon an agricultural setting. However, "the month of Abib" here is simply a calendrical designation, and the stated reason for its significance is the occurrence of the Exodus at this time rather than the ripening of the grain. An

---

<sup>1</sup>Origen's rescension of the LXX assimilates to Exod 34:18 when it has ἐξῆλθες ("you came out of") but omits any translation of הוציאך יהוה אלהיך ("Yahweh your God brought you out of").

<sup>2</sup>See BDB, 1; Koehler and Baumgartner, 4.

agricultural setting for Passover observance is accordingly no more implied here than is Mars worship when reference is made today to events occurring in the month of "March."

Deut 16:2, 5-7 stresses the centralized observance of Passover, but it does not indicate whether Passover observance itself is dependent upon centralization.

The particular contribution of Deut 16 to this study is the portrayal of the Passover in vs. 1 as an institution originating at the time of the Exodus.

#### The Festival/Feast of Unleavened Bread Exod 12:14-20

The instructions for the future observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 12:14-20 are a continuation of the divine speech report of Exod 12:1-13, in which Moses and Aaron are given instructions for the observance of the Egyptian Passover.<sup>1</sup>

According to Exod 12:14, 17, the Feast of Unleavened Bread is specifically instituted to commemorate the Exodus, so a prima facie case exists that it is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 152.

permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.<sup>1</sup>

והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחתם אתו חג ליהוה לדורותיכם חקת עולם תמננו . . .  
 ושמרתם אתהמניית כי בעצם היום הזה הוצאתי את צבא אוהיכם מארץ מצרים  
 ושמרתם אתהיום הזה לדורותיכם חקת עולם

- 14 And this day shall be a memorial for you and you must celebrate it as a feast to Yahweh. Throughout your generations you must celebrate it as an enduring statute. . . .
- 17 And you must keep the [Feast of] Unleavened Bread<sup>2</sup> because on this very day I brought your hosts out of the land of Egypt, and you must keep this day throughout your generations [as] an enduring statute.

Exod 12:19, 20 specifically includes the alien with the native of the land in the prohibition against eating leaven, and so it contains no limitation in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.

---

<sup>1</sup>The instructions to Moses in Exod 12:14-20 do not relate to the immediate events surrounding the Exodus itself. In Exod 12:38, the Israelites are pictured as baking unleavened bread at the stopping place of Sukkoth, but from their perspective, this is due to the haste of their departure, rather than to a deliberate fulfillment of a divine command. In fact, Moses is not even pictured as saying anything to the Israelites about the Feast of Unleavened Bread until after the people have left Egypt. See Exod 13:3-10. Likewise, the narrative nowhere pictures the Israelites at the time of the Exodus as observing the first and seventh days of the festal period, according to the commandment of Exod 12:16. However, it clearly does picture the future observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread as being commanded at the time of Israel's departure from Egypt.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX, has המצוה ("the commandment") instead of המצות ("the unleavened bread").

שבעת ימים שאר לא ימצא בבתיכם כי כל־אכל מחמצת ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מערת  
 ישראל בנר ובאזרח הארץ: כל־מחמצת לא תאכלו בכל מושבתיכם תאכלו מצות

- 19 For seven days leaven must not be in your houses, because as for anyone who eats anything that causes fermentation, that person will be cut off from the congregation, whether the alien or the native of the land.
- 20 You must not eat anything that causes fermentation. In all your dwellings you must eat unleavened bread.

However, the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is clearly here in view. It has been argued that although the uncircumcised alien is not required to observe Passover, he is forbidden to eat unleavened bread because the alien "is bound by the prohibitive commandments and not by the performative ones."<sup>1</sup> However, Exod 12:19 is dependent on vss. 48, 49, and therefore "presupposes that the alien is circumcised."<sup>2</sup> The statement of Exod 12:19 that the person who eats leaven during the feast will be cut off "from the congregation of Israel" (מערת ישראל) clearly "emphasizes the sphere of the sinner's existence as the cultic community of Israel."<sup>3</sup> It is clear that the uncircumcised alien does not exist as part of this sphere,

---

<sup>1</sup>Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 1055; idem, "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel," Journal of Biblical Literature 101 (1982): 169-176.

<sup>2</sup>van Houten, 137.

<sup>3</sup>D. J. Wold, "The Meaning of the Biblical Penalty *Kareth*" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1978), 71.

because in vs. 47 it is commanded that "all the congregation of Israel" (כל־עדה ישראל) should observe the Passover, while in vs. 48 the uncircumcised alien is specifically excluded from its observance.

In conclusion, Exod 12:14-20 pictures the Feast of Unleavened Bread as being instituted as a specific memorial of the Exodus. Vss. 19, 20 include the alien with the native of the land in the prohibition against eating leaven, but in this case only the circumcised alien is in view.<sup>1</sup>

#### Exod 13:3-10

Exod 12:51 records the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, while Exod 13:1, 2 records the command from Yahweh for the sanctification of all the firstborn, whether human beings or domestic animals.<sup>2</sup> Exod 13:3-10 pictures Moses as giving the people their first instructions concerning the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

---

<sup>1</sup>On the impossibility of using the expression אֹרֶחַ הָאָרֶץ ("the native of the land") in Exod 12:19 as a geographic limitation on the observance of this feast, see above, p. 156, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>The firstlings laws appear to be independent of the regulations governing Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, but are here placed in close proximity with them because of their common concern with the human firstborn. See J. B. Segal, The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70, London Oriental Series, vol. 12 (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 105, 183.

Like Exod 12:14, 17, Exod 13:3 pictures Passover as being specifically instituted to commemorate the Exodus:

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם זָכוֹר אֶת־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר יֵצְאתֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים כִּי בַחֹק יָרְדָּה הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם מִזֶּה וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל חֶמֶץ

And Moses said to the people, "You must remember this day when you have come out of Egypt,<sup>1</sup> out of the house of slaves, for with a strong hand Yahweh has brought you out of it, and leavened bread must not be eaten."

Accordingly, in Exod 13:3, as in Exod 12:14-20, a *prima facie* case exists that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX, the Syriac version, and the Vulgate, adds the prepositional phrase **בְּ** after **יֵצְאתֶם**, leading to the alternate translation, "You must remember this day on which you have come out." The Samaritan Pentateuch is also followed by the LXX and the Syriac version when it reads **מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם** ("from the land of Egypt") instead of **מִמִּצְרַיִם** ("from Egypt").

<sup>2</sup>Exod 13:5 states that when Yahweh has brought the people to the promised land, then they are to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread. However, as in Exod 12:25, this qualification is best understood as an expression of the divine intention that Israel should enter the promised land shortly after her departure from Egypt, rather than as a temporal or geographical restriction on the time or place of future Passover observances. See above, p. 156, n. 2.

In fact, there is no evidence in the Pentateuch that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is an agricultural festival, as noted by Green, 195-200; Hartley, 379; Levine, 264; Bernard R. Goldstein and Alan Cooper, "The Festivals of Israel and Judah and the Literary History of the Pentateuch," JAOS 110 (1910): 22; Jörn Halbe, "Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Wesen des Massotfestes," ZAW 87 (1975): 324-346; B. N. Wambacq, "Les Massot," Bib 61 (1980): 31-54; H. L. Ginsberg, The Israelelean Heritage of Judaism, Texts



Exod 23:15

The first of the three "pilgrim feasts" of Exod 23:14-17 is the Feast of Unleavened Bread in vs. 15:

את־הַנֶּחֱמֵץ תִּשְׁמֹר שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל מִצַּת כֹּאשֶׁר צִוִּיתָךְ לְמוֹעֵד חֹדֶשׁ הַבֵּיב כִּי־בֹ  
יֵצֵאת מִמִּצְרַיִם וְלֹא־יֵרָאוּ פְנֵי רִיקָם

You must keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. For seven days you may eat unleavened bread, just as I have commanded you, in the appointed time of the month of Abib, for in it you came out of Egypt, and they must not appear before me empty-handed.

Exod 23:15 confirms the Exodus from Egypt as the reason for the timing of the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, so a *prima facie* case exists here that this feast is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

The command that the people not appear before Yahweh empty-handed anticipates the centralization of the feast, indicated in the summary statement of Exod 23:17, but it does not indicate whether the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread itself is dependent upon centralization.<sup>1</sup>

---

and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, vol. 24 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1982), 44.

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 96-101. On the impossibility of using the expression "Month of Abib" as a limitation of the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread to agricultural conditions, see above, p. 164.

Exod 34:18-20

The Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 34:18-20 is the first of the three "pilgrim feasts" listed in Exod 34:18-24. Exod 23:15 is virtually repeated in Exod 34:18.

אחדת המצות השמר שבעת ימים תאכל מצות אשר צייתך למועד חרש האיו כי בחרש  
האכיל יצאת ממצרים

You must keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. For seven days you must eat unleavened bread, which<sup>1</sup> I have commanded you, in the appointed time of the month of Abib, for in the month of Abib<sup>2</sup> you came out of Egypt.

Exod 34:19, 20 contains firstlings laws,<sup>3</sup> then Exod 34:20 concludes with the same phrase as Exod 23:15, ולא יראו פני ריקם ("and they must not appear before me empty-handed"). Like Exod 23:15, Exod 34:18 confirms the Exodus from Egypt as the reason for the timing of the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, so a prima facie case also exists here that this feast is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a

---

<sup>1</sup>Many manuscripts, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and a multitude of versions assimilate to Exod 23:15 in reading כאשר ("just as") instead of אשר ("which").

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Exod 23:15 in reading בו ("in it") instead of בחרש האכיל ("in the month of Abib").

<sup>3</sup>On the close linkage in the text between laws concerning the Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread and the firstlings laws, see above, p. 168, n. 2.

sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.<sup>1</sup>

Lev 23:6-8

The instructions concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Lev 23:6-8 follow immediately after the command concerning the Passover in Lev 23:5. However, these verses do not provide any criteria to establish whether the Feast of Unleavened Bread is permanent or temporary.

Num 28:17-25

As in Lev 23:5-8, the instructions concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Num 28:17-25 follow immediately after a command concerning the Passover (vs. 16). They contain considerable detail about the burnt offerings for this feast, but do not clarify the issue of whether the offerings are for the feast or the feast for the offerings. Accordingly, they do not provide any criteria to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary.

Deut 16:3, 4, 8

The Feast of Unleavened Bread in Deut 16 is not mentioned by name until vs. 16. The discussion of Passover

---

<sup>1</sup>The comments made on centralization and on the designation "the month of Abib" in Exod 23:15 also apply here. See above, p. 164.

dominates in vss. 1-8. Nevertheless, the Feast of

Unleavened Bread is clearly referred to in vss. 3, 4, 8:

לאֲתֹאכַל עֲלֵיִךְ חֶמֶץ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל־עֲלֵיִךְ מִצֹּת לֶחֶם עֲנִי כִּי בְחֶמְצוֹן יֵצֵאת מֵאֶרֶץ  
מִצְרַיִם לִמְעַן תִּזְכֹּר אֶת־יוֹם צֵאתְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם כָּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ: וְלֹא־יֵרָאֶה לְךָ שֹׂאֵר בְּכָל־  
נֶכְלְךָ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים וְלֹא־יִלִּין מִן־הַבָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר חֻבַּח בַּעֲרֹב בְּיוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן לְבִקְרָ:  
... שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תֹּאכַל מִצֹּת בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי עֲצֵרָת לִיְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה

- 3 On account of it [the Passover]<sup>1</sup> you must not eat<sup>2</sup> leaven. On account of it, you may eat unleavened bread of affliction for seven days (for in haste you came out<sup>3</sup> of the land of Egypt) so that you will remember the day of your departure from the land of Egypt all the days of your life.
- 4 And leaven<sup>4</sup> must not appear with you in all your borders for seven days, and none of the flesh that you must sacrifice in the evening<sup>5</sup> of the first day may remain until morning. . . .

---

<sup>1</sup>In defense of this translation of עֲלֵיִךְ, see below, pp. 174-177. In an instance of haplography, the Targum omits this prepositional phrase here, while retaining it later in the verse.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX and the Pseudo-Targum Jonathan clearly read לֹא תֹאכְלוּ ("you must not eat"—plural) rather than לֹא תֹאכַל ("you must not eat"—singular), both here and later in the verse.

<sup>3</sup>The Syriac clearly reads יֵצֵאתֶם ("you came out"—plural) rather than יֵצֵאת ("you came out"—singular).

<sup>4</sup>The connective waw ("and") is omitted at Qumran, as reflected in some LXX manuscripts.

<sup>5</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Exod 12:6 when it reads בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים ("between the evenings") rather than בַּעֲרֹב ("in the evening").

- 8 For six days you must eat unleavened bread, but on the seventh day [is] a solemn assembly<sup>1</sup> to Yahweh your God. You must not do work.<sup>2</sup>

Deut 16:3 confirms the Exodus from Egypt as the reason for the timing of the celebration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, so a *prima facie* case exists that this feast is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

In this study, it is argued that the prepositional phrase *עליו* in Deut 16:3 shows that the obligation to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread presupposes and depends on the prior obligation to observe the Passover. In other words, Deut 16:3 indicates a limitation to the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in terms of the fifth criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Exod 13:6 when it reads *חג* ("feast") instead of *עצרת* ("solemn assembly").

<sup>2</sup>Many manuscripts, followed by some versions, assimilate to the form of work prohibitions elsewhere in festal lists when they read *כל מלאכה* ("any work") instead of just *מלאכה* ("work"). The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to Lev 23:8 and Num 28:25 in its reading, *כל מלאכה עברה* ("any servile work"). The LXX reading *ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν ἔργον, πλην ὅσα ποιηθήσεται ψυχῇ* ("on it [you must not do] any work, except whatever must be done for life") is interpretive.

Traditionally, עֲלֵי has here been translated as "with it," as in the NASB: "You shall not eat leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat with it unleavened bread." (Deut 16:3a). The most obvious antecedent for the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix is the noun פֶּסַח or "Passover" in Deut 16:2. However, as Elias Auerbach asks, "How can anyone eat unleavened bread for seven days with an offering that is brought on the eve of the first day, and that must not have any left over even on the first morning?"<sup>1</sup> Auerbach's own answer is to see the reference to seven days in Deut 16:3 as a priestly insertion.<sup>2</sup> However, such an explanation is hardly persuasive, "since it is precisely in a literary fusion that one would expect smoothness rather than clumsiness of writing."<sup>3</sup>

Keil and Delitzsch maintain that in Deut 16:1, 2 "the word 'Passover' . . . includes not only the paschal lamb, but the paschal sacrifices generally," i.e., "all the sacrifices that were slain . . . during the seven days of the Mazzoth, . . . for the purpose of holding sacrificial

---

<sup>1</sup>"Aber wie kann man *sieben Tage massot* essen über einem Opfer, das am Vorabend des ersten Tages dargebracht wird, und von dem schon am ersten Morgen nichts übrig sein soll?" Elias Auerbach, "Die Feste im alten Israel," VT 8 (1958): 3, commenting on Deut 16:3, 4.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup>M. H. Segal, 203.

meals."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Deut 16:3 is understood as forbidding the eating of leaven with any of these meals. However, this hypothesis is unlikely, given the restriction of the ~~חם~~ sacrifice to the offering of the first evening in Deut 16:6.

More consistent than the proposal of Keil and Delitzsch is Craigie's suggestion that if Deut 16:3 refers to all the sacrifices of the seven-day festival, the antecedent of "it" in the phrase ~~עליו~~ simply remains unexpressed.<sup>2</sup> However, a clear antecedent within the immediate context is to be preferred to an unexpressed antecedent from an entirely different part of the Pentateuch.

Mitchell Dahood's solution is to translate ~~עליו~~ as "in His presence."<sup>3</sup> In other words, no leaven is to be eaten in the presence of Yahweh or at his sanctuary for seven days. However, in this case it would have been clearer and more consistent to use the expressions ~~אל פני~~

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, vol. 3, BC, trans. James Martin (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949), 374, 375. See also Mekilta Exod 12:5; Siphre to Deuteronomy 129:3; J. B. Segal, 204, 205.

<sup>2</sup>See Craigie, 242, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Mitchell Dahood, review of The Torah [תורה]: The Five Books of Moses, a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text, in Bib 45 (1964): 283.

יהוה, לפני יהוה, or את פני יהוה, as in Exod 23:17; 34:23, or Deut 16:11, 16.

Kiker argues that the preposition על

was used occasionally to denote cause or reason, hence "on account of." . . . In the context under consideration protection from corruption was being stressed. . . . Hence ground or reason may well have been the signification of the preposition in this instance: "On account of it [the Passover] you shall not eat leaven; on account of it you shall eat unleavened bread for seven days."<sup>1</sup>

Kiker's translation of עלי is to be preferred to the other translations examined in this study because it is appropriate to the context and lacks the difficulties they pose. The unleavened bread is thus an accompaniment to the Paschal sacrifice and has no status independent of the sacrifice itself. Instead, this feast presupposes the celebration of Passover and is dependent upon it.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Kiker, 96, brackets his. Examples of the use of the preposition על to denote cause or reason include Gen 20:3; 21:12; 26:7, 9; 27:41; 42:21; Exod 17:7; Lev 4:3, 28; 5:18; 19:17; 26:18, 24, 28; Deut 9:18; 24:16; 31:18; Josh 9:20; Job 32:3; Pss 39:12; 44:23; 50:8; 69:8; Prov 28:21; Isa 1:16; 2:5; 5:9; 9:12; 15:5; 16:8; Ezek 18:26; Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13. The same connotation is evident in phrases such as על-כן and על-זאת ("therefore"). See BDB, 754; Koehler and Baumgartner, 704.

<sup>2</sup>The position is only marginally different if one adopts the position of Keil and Delitzsch or of Craigie. In their proposals, the unleavened bread is an accompaniment to the sacrificial meals eaten during the week long feast, and so the prohibition against eating it is again dependent on the continued operation of the sacrificial system.



In conclusion, Deut 16:3 pictures the Feast of Unleavened Bread as being instituted as a specific memorial of the Exodus and presents the obligation to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread as dependent upon the continued applicability of the Passover.

#### The Festival of the Wavesheaf in Lev 23:9-14

The second divine speech of Lev 23 follows the instruction about the Festival of Unleavened Bread in vss. 6-8 and begins with instruction about the Festival of the Wavesheaf in vss. 9-14. According to vss. 9-11,

וידבר יהוה אל־משה לאמר: דבר אל־בני ישראל ואמרת אל־הם כִּי־חֲבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ  
אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי נֹתֵן לָכֶם וקצרתם אֶחָד־קְצִירָהּ וְהִבֵּאתֶם אֶת־עֹמֶר רֵאשִׁית קְצִירְכֶם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן:  
וְהִנִּיף אֶת־הָעֹמֶר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְרֹצְנֶכֶם מִמַּחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת יָנִיפֵה הַכֹּהֵן

- 9 And Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying,
- 10 "Speak to the Children of Israel, and say to them, 'when you come to the land that I am giving you and you harvest its harvest, then you must bring the sheaf of the firstfruit of your harvest<sup>1</sup> to the priest.
- 11 "'He must wave the sheaf before Yahweh for your acceptance. On the day after the Sabbath the priest must wave it.'"

Lev 23:12, 13 prescribes the offering to accompany the waving of the sheaf. The offering of the wavesheaf and the lifting of the ban on eating the new crop are tied together in vs. 14:

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by Pseudo-Targum Jonathan, has the appositional expression, **העמר ראשית** ("the sheaf, the firstfruits of your harvest"), instead of the single construct chain, **עמר ראשית קצירכם** ("the sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest").

ולחם וקלי וכרמל לא תאכלו עד עצם היום הזה עד הביאכם את קרבן אלהיכם חקת  
עולם לדורותיכם בכל משבתיכם

And you must not eat the bread or parched grain or new corn until this same day, until you bring the offering of your God. [It is] an enduring statute throughout your generations in all your dwelling places.<sup>1</sup>

Lev 23:15 clearly refers to the Festival of the Wavesheaf as the starting point for calculating the Feast of Weeks, but otherwise there are no explicit references to this festival in the Old Testament apart from Lev 23:9-14.<sup>2</sup>

Henry T. C. Sun notes that the speech of Lev 23:10-

---

<sup>1</sup>On the translation of קלי as "parched grain" and of כרמל as "new corn," see Koehler and Baumgartner, 456, 839.

<sup>2</sup>Nevertheless, the link between the timing of Passover in Lev 23:10 and the consumption of the new crop in Lev 23:14 seems to be implicit in Josh 5:10-12.

Deut 16:9, 10 specifically dates the seven weeks culminating in the Feast of Weeks from the start of the grain harvest, but unlike Lev 23:20, it does not describe an attendant ceremony to mark the beginning of this calculation.

Firstfruit offerings are mentioned in Lev 2:11-16; Num 18:12, 13; Deut 26:1-11. However, these passages describe individual firstfruit offerings, while the waving of "the sheaf of the firstfruits" (את־עמר ראשית) in Lev 23:10 seems to describe a community offering. E.g., see Hartley, 385; Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, vol. 2, 440. All grain offerings seem to be classified as a קרבן ראשית ("offering of firstfruits") in Lev 2:11, 12 and only Lev 2:14-16 prescribes an offering that might be offered specifically at the time of the Festival of the Wavesheaf. However, even if this festival is in view in Lev 2:14-16, this passage still does not provide any criteria to establish whether it is permanent or temporary.

Num 18:12, 13 does not seem to be concerned with any festival per se. Instead, it simply lists the firstfruits of all different plant produce as part of a longer listing of the portion belonging to the priests (Num 18:8-24). Deut 26:1-11 should be linked with the Feast of Weeks/Harvest rather than with the Festival of the Wavesheaf. See below, p. 191.

14a is "cast in 'if-you' casuistic form," with vs. 14b "being a superscription to the unit as a whole."<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, "the conditions expressed in the protasis include entrance into the promised land and harvesting while the apodosis prescribes the bringing of the sheaf to the priest and the subsequent acts."<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the observance of the Festival of the Wavesheaf presupposes agricultural conditions: a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary, concerning the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In terms of this fourth criterion, b. Sukkah 41b argues that the use of the term **עצם** in Lev 23:14 makes the lifting of the ban on the new crops dependent on the arrival of the day itself, rather than on the ritual prescribed for the day. Accordingly, the ban is retained until the day of the festival, even though the offering of the sheaf is no longer possible now that the temple has been destroyed.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the phrase **עַד־הֵבִיאֲכֶם אֶת־קֶרְבֶּן אֱלֹהֵיכֶם** ("until you have brought the offering of your

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry T. C. Sun, "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26)" (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1990), 379.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 379-380.

<sup>3</sup>For more information, see Bloch, 114, 115.

God") clearly stands in apposition to **עַד עֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** ("until this same day") as a further explanation and specification of its meaning. In other words, the consumption of the new grain is prohibited until the day of the festival, precisely because it is on this day that the wavesheaf is offered, and not because of any intrinsic value inherent in the day itself. The prohibition against eating new grain in Lev 23:14 would thus have no status in the absence of the cult.<sup>1</sup>

Lev 23:11 places the offering of the wavesheaf "on the day after the Sabbath" (**מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת**). The "Sabbath" here has been variously identified as the full moon just before the Feast of Unleavened Bread,<sup>2</sup> the first day of the Feast, the weekly Sabbath during the Feast, the last day of the Feast, or the first weekly Sabbath after the Feast has finished.<sup>3</sup> In these five interpretations, the Sabbath in vs. 11 is identified in one way or another in relationship

---

<sup>1</sup>The view advanced in b. Sukkah 41b may partly be based on the admitted obscurity surrounding the true meaning of the term **עֵצֶם**. However, in support of translating the temporal phrase **עַד עֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** as "until this same day," it should be noted that **עֵצֶם** literally "means 'bone' or 'bone structure' and hence 'body'," and that it would thus be appropriate to read it as a restrictive term, "confining the time element exclusively within the body of time specified in a sentence." Bloch, 115. See also Koehler and Baumgartner, 728.

<sup>2</sup>See Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 147-151.

<sup>3</sup>See van Goudoever, 18-29.

to the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Accordingly, in all of them the continued obligation to observe the Festival of the Wavesheaf would be dependent upon the continued obligation to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread. This dependence would be a limitation in terms of the fifth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns its interrelationship with other sacred times. However, the Sabbath of vs. 11 may have no direct connection with the Feast of Unleavened Bread prescribed in the previous divine speech. Instead, it might simply be the first weekly Sabbath after the grain harvest has begun, whether or not it occurs in connection with the Feast of Unleavened Bread.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, Lev 23:9-14 pictures agricultural conditions and the continued operation of the sacrificial system as constituent elements necessary for its continued observance.

#### The Festival/Feast of Harvest/Weeks

##### Exod 23:16a

The second of the three "pilgrim feasts" listed in Exod 23:14-17 is the Feast of Harvest in vs. 16a:

---

<sup>1</sup>See H. G. Reventlow, Das Heiligkeitgesetz, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 6 (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961), 110, 111.

# וחג הקציר בכורי מעשיך אשר תזרע בשדה

And [you must keep] the Feast of the Harvest of the Firstfruits of your labors, that you sow in the field.

If the Feast of the Harvest is an agricultural festival, no observance of it would be expected in the nomadic conditions of the wilderness. There would thus be a geographic limitation on the observance of this feast in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance. However, Exod 23:16 does not provide sufficient information to determine whether the feast is called "the Feast of the Harvest of the Firstfruits of your labors" because it celebrates the harvest, or because it occurs at this time.<sup>1</sup>

## Exod 34:22a

"The Feast of Weeks . . . [of] the firstfruits of the harvest of your wheat"<sup>2</sup> in Exod 34:22a is the second of the three "pilgrim feasts" listed in vss. 21-24. As in Exod 23:16, there is insufficient information to determine

---

<sup>1</sup>Compare the discussion above, p. 164, on the dating of Passover to "the month of Abib."

<sup>2</sup>חג שבועת . . . בכורי קציר חטים. The construct חג governs the word שבועת and the construct chain בכורי קציר חטים. For other examples of a single head of a construct chain having two nominal coordinates, see Gen 14:19; Judg 1:16; 2 Sam 19:6, as cited by Waltke and O'Connor, 139.

whether the feast is a celebration of the harvest, or whether it simply occurs at harvest time.

Lev 23:15-22

The instructions about the Feast of Weeks in Lev 23:15-22 follow immediately after the instructions about the Festival of the Wavesheaf in vss. 9-14, concluding the second divine speech of Lev 23. Lev 23:15, 16 prescribes how the date for the Festival of Weeks is to be calculated:

וספרתם לכם ממחרת השבת מיום הביאכם את־עמר התנופה שבע שבתות המימָה  
תהיינה: עַד מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת הַשְּׁבִיעִית חֲסַפְרֵי חֲמִשִּׁים יוֹם וְהִקְרַבְתֶּם מִנְחָה חֲדָשָׁה לַיהוָה

- 15 And you must reckon from the day after the Sabbath. From the day you bring the wavesheaf, there must be seven complete weeks.<sup>1</sup>  
16 Until the day after the seventh Sabbath, you must count fifty days, then you must bring an offering of new grain to Yahweh.

Lev 23:17-20 prescribes the special offering for this Festival. Vs. 21 adds:

וּקְרַאתֶם בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה לָכֶם כָּל־מְלֹאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ חֻקַּת עוֹלָם  
בְּכָל־מוֹשְׁבֵיכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם

---

<sup>1</sup>In a case of haplography, some LXX manuscripts do not translate the verb תהיינה ("there must be"), but read the whole of vs. 15 as a single sentence, with the temporal phrases "from the day after the Sabbath" and "from the day you have brought the wavesheaf" standing in apposition to one another. The reading ἀποσφραγίζετε ("you must count") in other LXX manuscripts is an assimilation to the first verb of the verse, just as the addition of ὑμῖν ("to you") in some LXX manuscripts is an assimilation to the use of the prepositional phrase לכם near the beginning of the verse.

And you must make a proclamation on this same day.<sup>1</sup> It must be a holy time for you.<sup>2</sup> You must do no servile work [as] an enduring statute in all your dwelling places throughout your generations.

The admonition of Lev 23:22 closes the second divine speech of the chapter:

ובקצרכם אתקציר ארצכם לאתכלה מאת שרך בקצרך ולקט קצירך לא תלקט  
לעני ולגר תעזב אתם אני יהוה אלהיכם

And when you harvest the harvest of your land, do not finish the corner of your field when you harvest,<sup>3</sup> and the gleanings of your harvest do not glean. Leave them for the needy and the alien. I [am] Yahweh your God.

The placing of the admonition of Lev 23:22 in the setting of the Feast of Weeks confirms that this feast is a harvest celebration, and not just a feast that incidentally occurs at harvest time. In other words, the Feast of Weeks presupposes agricultural conditions rather than the nomadic conditions of the wilderness wanderings. This fact constitutes a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX, followed by the Vulgate, does not translate **בנעצם**, but reads **היום הזה** ("this day") as the direct object of **ומקראתם**, and interprets **מקרא** as an absolute noun, when it renders vs. 21a as **καὶ καλέσετε ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν κλητήν· ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῖν** ("And you must proclaim this day as a proclamation. It will be holy to you").

<sup>2</sup>The Syriac clearly reads **מקרא קדש** as the direct object of the verb **וקראתם** at the beginning of vs. 21 when it omits any translation of **יהיה לכם** ("it must be . . . for you").

<sup>3</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch reads **לקצר** instead of **בקצרך**, leading to the alternate translation, "do not finish harvesting [at] the corner of your field."



used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In Lev 23:15, the Festival of Weeks is not dated independently, but rather in relationship to the offering of the Wavesheaf. Accordingly, this verse contains a limitation in terms of the fifth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times. In other words, it has been claimed that "when Israel is in exile and there is no cutting of the Omer, it must nevertheless celebrate the festival of Shavuot,"<sup>1</sup> and extensive reference has sometimes been made to the Feast of Weeks without any reference to the Wavesheaf.<sup>2</sup> However, in contrast to such extrabiblical claims and references, Lev 23:15 suggests that without the Festival of the Wavesheaf, there can be no Feast of Weeks.<sup>3</sup>

In conclusion, Lev 23:15-22 stresses the agricultural nature of the Feast of Weeks and presents the

---

<sup>1</sup>Monford Harris, 38.

<sup>2</sup>As in Jubilees. See J. B. Segal, 235.

<sup>3</sup>This unity between the two festivals is also recognized by Josephus Antiquities of the Jews 3.10, who claims that the Feast of Pentecost was entitled Ἀσάρθᾳ ("conclusion") because it came at the close of the seven weeks. For more information, see Keil and Delitzsch, Pentateuch, 3:444.

obligation to observe it as dependent on the continued applicability of the Festival of the Wavesheaf.<sup>1</sup>

Num 28:26-31

Immediately following the instructions about the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Num 28:16-25 come the instructions about the Feast of Weeks in vss. 26-31. The basic prescription is given in vs. 26, in which it is called "the day of the firstfruits" (יום הַבְּכֹרִים). Vss. 27-31 prescribe the burnt offering for this festival.

As in Exod 23:16; 34:22, there is no indication in Num 28:26-31 of whether the Feast of Weeks simply occurs at the time the firstfruits have been reaped, or whether it is a specifically agricultural celebration.

---

<sup>1</sup>In terms of the third criterion, it has been argued that according to Lev 23:22, special consideration is to be given to the needs of the נָכְרִי or alien during the celebration of the Feast of Weeks. E.g., see R. K. Harrison, Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 218; R. Laird Harris, "Leviticus," EBC, ed. Frank A. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, 1990), 2:626. However, given the prohibition against any servile work in vs. 21, it is unlikely that the instructions of vs. 22 would apply directly to the celebration of the day itself. Instead, it is appended here on the basis of the association of ideas, since the Feast of Weeks is a harvest festival. See Hartley, 369. It is not denied here that special consideration of the needs of the alien is an important part of the celebration in Deut 16:11 and 26:11. It is simply denied that Lev 23:22 directly refers to the feast itself.

Deut 16:9-12

Immediately following the instructions about the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Deut 16:1-8 come the instructions about the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in vss. 9-12:

שבעה שבועות תספר לך מהחל חרמש בקמה תחל לספר שבעה שבועות: ועשית חג שבעות ליהוה אלהיך מסת נדבת ירך אשר תתן כאשר יברך יהוה אלהיך: ושמחת לפני יהוה אלהיך אתה ובנך ובתך ועבדך ואמתך והלוי אשר בשעריך והגר והיתום והאלמנה אשר בקרבך במקום אשר יבחר יהוה אלהיך לשכון שמו שם: וזכרת כי עבד היית במצרים ושמרת ועשית את החקים האלה

- 9 You must reckon seven weeks. From the putting<sup>1</sup> of the sickle into the grain you must begin to count seven weeks.
- 10 Then you must observe a Feast of Weeks to Yahweh your God, [and bring] a proportionate freewill offering of your hand,<sup>2</sup> which you must give<sup>3</sup> according to how Yahweh your God blesses you.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by some LXX manuscripts and the Syriac, has . . . מהחלך ("from your putting in of the sickle") rather than . . . מהחל ("from the putting in of the sickle"). This variant reading is an assimilation to the use of second person singular forms throughout the passage.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the Syriac, has the plural ידיך ("your hands") instead of the singular ידך ("your hand").

<sup>3</sup>The LXX rendering δέῃ clearly reflects the Hebrew reading יתן ("he must give") with "Yahweh your God" as the subject instead of תתן ("you must give"). The addition of σοί in the codex Vaticanus is a natural extension of this alternative reading.

<sup>4</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX and the Targum, assimilates to Deut 15:14 when it has the perfect ברכך ("has blessed you") rather than the imperfect יברך ("blesses you"). In a case of haplography, the codex Vaticanus omits any rendering of the phrase כאשר יברך

- 11 And you are to rejoice before Yahweh your God: you, and your son, and your daughter, and your male servant,<sup>1</sup> and your female servant, and the Levite who [is] in your gates; and the alien, and the fatherless, and the widow who is in your midst, at the place that Yahweh your God chooses to have his name dwell.
- 12 And you must remember that you were a servant in Egypt,<sup>2</sup> and you must keep and do these statutes.

Deut 16:11 includes the גֵּר or alien in the celebration of the feast, and so is relevant to the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. The dependent status of the גֵּר is emphasized by his inclusion in a list of household members, the landless, and the poor. The reminder of Israel's servitude in Deut 16:12 suggests that just as in Exod 23:12 the term גֵּר says nothing about religious practice per se, but rather about the vulnerability of any alien living outside his homeland.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the uncircumcised

---

("according to how he blesses you").

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by some LXX manuscripts and the Vulgate, omits the connective waw ("and") before עֶבֶד ("your male servant").

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch and some Massoretic manuscripts, followed by some LXX manuscripts, assimilate to Deut 5:15 when it reads בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם ("in the land of Egypt") instead of בְּמִצְרַיִם ("in Egypt").

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 127. The admonition concerning Israel's servitude in Deut 16:12 is a prod to give due consideration to the needs of dependent classes, rather than a reason for the observance of the Feast of Weeks per se. However, an historical basis for the Feast of Weeks is

alien is clearly included in Deut 16:11. However, its injunction is permissive and idealistic rather than obligatory, for vs. 16 requires only that "all your males" (כל־זכר) attend the Feast of Weeks.<sup>1</sup>

The emphasis on bringing a "proportionate" freewill offering in Deut 16:9, 10 confirms that this feast is indeed a celebration of the grain harvest, and not just a feast that coincidentally occurs at harvest time. This passage thus clearly stresses the agricultural nature of the Feast of Weeks and accordingly contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, Deut 16:9-12 encourages but does not insist on the participation of uncircumcised aliens in observing the Feast of Weeks, and emphasizes its agricultural nature.

---

evident in Deut 26:1-11. See below, pp. 191, 192.

<sup>1</sup>Craigie, 246.

<sup>2</sup>"The Feast of Weeks was a celebration essentially of the gracious provision of God in the harvest; the feast would become an essential part of Israelite life in the future when agriculture became the basis of society." Craigie, 244.

Deut 26:1-11

Deut 26:1-11 does not mention the Feast of Weeks or any other festival by name. However, Deut 26:11 stresses a communal celebration appropriate to a festal setting.<sup>1</sup> This passage also prescribes an offering of firstfruits particularly appropriate to a Feast of Firstfruits (see Deut 16:9-12).

The second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem. In terms of this criterion, it should be noted that Deut 26:1-11 has an historical dimension specifically linked to Israel's possession of the promised land. In the declaration of vs. 3b, "the worshipper acknowledges that he has come, not to any land, but precisely to the land which Yahweh promised to the fathers:"<sup>2</sup>

ואמרת אליו הנדתי היום ליהוה אלהיך כי באחי אל הארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותינו  
לחת לנו

---

<sup>1</sup>See Moshe Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 221; C. M. Carmichael, The Laws of Deuteronomy (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974), 246.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. Thompson, Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974; 3d American Printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), 254.

And you must say to him [the priest], "I declare today to Yahweh your God<sup>1</sup> that I have come to the land that Yahweh<sup>2</sup> swore to our fathers to give to us."

In the prescribed response to the priest in vss. 5-10, historical confession is also basic, with the specificity of the land coming to the fore in vs. 9:

ויבאנו אל־המקום הזה ויתן־לנו את־הארץ הזאת חלב ודבש

And he [Yahweh] has brought us to this place and has given us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey.

However, there is no indication whether this historical dimension of the feast is the reason for its observance, or whether it is a feature added to what is otherwise a universally applicable festival.<sup>3</sup>

The third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the identity of those who observe it, and in terms of this criterion it should be noted that Deut 26:11, like Deut 16:11, makes provision for the alien to participate in this celebration:

ושמחת בכל־השוב עשר נתן־לך יהוה אלהיך ולביתך אתה והלוי והגר אשר בקרבך

---

<sup>1</sup>Given the confessional nature of the verse, it is not surprising that some LXX manuscripts evidently read אלהי ("my God") rather than אלהיך ("your God").

<sup>2</sup>The apparent reading of אלהיך ("your God") after יהוה ("Yahweh") in the Syriac is an assimilation to the expression יהוה אלהיך ("Yahweh your God") earlier in the verse.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 148, on Deut 5:12-15.

And you are to rejoice in all the goodness that Yahweh your God has given to you and to your household: you<sup>1</sup> and the Levite and the alien who [is] in your midst.

The alien here is listed with the dependent Levite, and as in Deut 16:11, the uncircumcised alien is no doubt included.<sup>2</sup> There is no indication of whether the inclusion of the alien is permissive and idealistic or whether it is obligatory.

The whole of Deut 26:1-11 emphasizes the agricultural nature of the celebration of the Feast, so that no observance of it would be expected in the nomadic conditions of the wilderness. Accordingly, it contains a clear limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In conclusion, Deut 26:1-11 gives an historical dimension to the Feast of Weeks. However, there is no indication whether this factor is the reason for its observance, or whether it is a feature added to what is otherwise a universally applicable festival. The passage includes the uncircumcised alien in the festal celebration,

---

<sup>1</sup>Some LXX manuscripts clearly read ולביתך ("and to your household") and אתה ("you") as part of a single expression, when they give the rendering, σὺ καὶ ἡ οἰκία σου (the equivalent of אתה וביתך, "you and your household").

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 189.



but does not explain whether this inclusion is permissive and idealistic or whether it is obligatory. It also stresses the agricultural nature of the Feast of Weeks.

### The Festival of Trumpets

#### Lev 23:23-25

Immediately following the instructions about the Festival of Weeks in Lev 23:15-22 come the instructions about the Festival of Trumpets in the third divine speech of the chapter (vss. 23-25):

וַיִּדְבֹר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר: דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ  
יְהִי לָכֶם שַׁבָּתוֹן זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ: כָּל־מְלֹאכֶת עֲבֹדָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ וְהִקְדַּבְתֶּם  
אֵשֶׁה לַיהוָה

- 23 And Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying,  
24 "Speak to the Children of Israel, saying, 'on the seventh month, on the first day of the month, you must have a sabbath, a reminder by acclamation,<sup>1</sup> a holy time.  
25 You must not do any work, and you must offer a generous gift<sup>2</sup> to Yahweh.'"

Lev 23:23-25 contains a limitation in terms of the fifth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which

---

<sup>1</sup>The word זִכְרוֹן has here been read in construct with תְּרוּעָה as a genitive of instrument. See Waltke and O'Connor, 144. It is also possible to read זִכְרוֹן as an absolute noun standing in apposition with תְּרוּעָה, leading to the translation, "a reminder, an acclamation." However, this alternative reading does not entail any significant difference in meaning.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX reading ὀλοκαύτωμα reflects the reading עלה ("burnt offering") rather than אֵשֶׁה ("generous gift").

concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times, as becomes clear when attention is given to the words זכרון ("reminder") and תרועה (here translated as "a blowing of trumpets").

As for the word זכרון, this noun may have the retrospective sense of remembering the past.<sup>1</sup> However, it is overwhelmingly used in the Pentateuch to encourage present and future remembrance.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, even when it is used with reference to a past event, its purpose is still to shape future action (E.g., Exod 13:9; Num 16:40 [17:5, Hebrew]). Accordingly, in Lev 23:24 זכרון should "be rendered, 'a reminding' of something present, or of something just at hand; rather than 'memorial,' which suggests the past,"<sup>3</sup> and all the more so since the Pentateuch does not give the Festival of Trumpets an historical basis. It is unclear whether the blowing of trumpets is primarily an anthropopathic reminder to God of

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., as in Eccl 1:11; 2:16. These and the references cited to זכרון in the rest of the paragraph are listed by Wigram, 387, 389.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Exod 17:14; 28:12, 29; 30:16; 39:7; Num 5:15, 18; 10:10; 31:54.

<sup>3</sup>Andrew A. Bonar, A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus (Evansville, IN: Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959), 413.

Israel's need<sup>1</sup> or a divine reminder to Israel of God's claim.<sup>2</sup>

As for the word תְּרוּעָה, this noun is used in a variety of settings, such as in the context of the proclamation of the beginning of the Jubilee (Lev 25:9), the summoning and organizing of the Israelite camp (Num 10:5, 6), the expression of corporate dedication to Yahweh (2 Chr 15:14), the expression of joy,<sup>3</sup> imminent victory in battle,<sup>4</sup> and the acclamation of Yahweh's kingship (Num 23:21; Ps 47:5 [vs. 6, Hebrew]).<sup>5</sup>

Integrating these analyses of זָכְרֹן and תְּרוּעָה, the Festival of Trumpets may be an occasion for reminding Yahweh of something—perhaps of his promises—as part of an act of corporate dedication (as in 2 Chr 15:14). On the

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Exod 28:12, 29; 30:16; 39:7; Num 5:15, 18; 10:10; 31:54. See also Hartley, 387; Jon Paulien, Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12, AUSDDS, vol. 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988), 207, 222.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see Exod 13:9; 17:14; Num 16:40 (17:5, Hebrew).

<sup>3</sup>1 Sam 4:5, 6; 2 Sam 6:15; 1 Chr 15:28; Ezra 3:11, 12, 13; Job 8:21; 33:26; Pss 27:6; 33:3; 89:15 (vs. 16, Hebrew); 150:5.

<sup>4</sup>Num 23:21; 31:6; Josh 6:5, 20; 2 Chr 13:12; Job 39:25; Jer 4:19; 20:16; 49:2; Ezek 21:22 (vs. 27, Hebrew); Amos 1:14; 2:2; Zeph 1:16.

<sup>5</sup>The references cited in this paragraph are listed in Wigram, 1358. For more information see Milgrom, Numbers, 200.

other hand, it may be an announcement of the beginning of a special time period (as in Lev 25:9) and/or a declaration of Yahweh's kingship (as in Num 23:21; Ps 47:5 [vs. 6, Hebrew]). However, in all these cases the Festival of Trumpets in Lev 23:23-25 clearly does not stand in isolation, but is instead an anticipation of the other two festive occasions of the seventh month: the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Booths. The continued obligation to observe the Festival of Trumpets is thus dependent on the continued obligation to observe either the Day of Atonement or the Feast of Booths.<sup>1</sup>

Num 29:1-6

The instructions about the Festival of Trumpets in Num 29:1-6 follow immediately after the instructions about the Feast of Weeks in Num 28:26-31. The burnt offering for the festival is prescribed in detail. However, the passage does not clarify the issue of whether the offering is for the festival or the festival for the offering. Accordingly, it does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Festival of Trumpets is permanent or temporary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Indeed, the fact that the Festival of Trumpets is a simple observance pointing to the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Booths is perhaps one reason why Lev 23:23-25 and other Old Testament references to this festival are so sketchy.

## The Day of Atonement

Exod 30:10

Exod 30:10 concludes the instructions for the altar of incense, starting in vs. 1, by commanding that "Aaron must make atonement once a year on its horns."<sup>1</sup> The Day of Atonement is not named, although it is clearly in view.<sup>2</sup> However, this verse does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Day of Atonement is permanent or temporary.

Lev 16

William H. Shea has argued that Lev 1-25 is essentially arranged as a chiasm, with Lev 16 standing at the fulcrum between the two limbs of the chiasm (Lev 1-15;

---

וּכְפַר אֶהְיֶה עַל קִרְנֹתָיו אֶחָד בַּשָּׁנָה<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Hartley, 240, 241, finds no instruction in Lev 16 for any blood manipulation in the outer sanctum of the sanctuary. He does not try to reconcile this finding with Exod 30:10.

Traditionally, the instructions in Lev 16:18, 19, have been interpreted as applying to the altar of incense. This position has been defended by Harrison, Leviticus, 173, but is soundly refuted by Hartley, 241.

The correct position is that the expression וּכֵן יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד ("and so must he do for the tent of meeting") in Lev 16:16 refers to the outer sanctum of the sanctuary, as argued by N. Kiuchi, The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function, JSOTSS, no. 56 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1987), 128. According to Hartley, 240, "The difficulty with this proposal is that it lacks support in the tradition." However, the same can be said of his own interpretation of Lev 16:18, 19. For more information, see Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 1034, 1035; Gane, "Ritual Dynamic Structure," 173, 174.

17-25), concluding and culminating the book's sacrificial legislation, as well as introducing the Holiness Code that follows.<sup>1</sup>

Lev 16:1-19 prescribes the correct ritual by which Aaron may enter the inner sanctum of the tabernacle, in contrast to the fatal entry made by his two sons (vss. 1, 2). The purpose of this entry is to make atonement for himself and his household (vss. 6, 11, 17), for the whole assembly of Israel (vs. 17), and ultimately for the sanctuary itself (vss. 16, 20). Vss. 20-28 prescribe the ceremonies to be observed after the entrances into the inner sanctum have been completed. Clearly, this whole ritual presupposes the continued operation of the sanctuary.

The date of the Day of Atonement and the duties of the people on the day are especially emphasized in Lev 16:29-31.

והייתה לכם לחקת עולם בחדש השביעי בעשור לחדש העני אחדנמשחיתכם וכל־מלאכה  
לא תעשו האזרח והגר הנר בתוכם: כִּי־ביום הזה יכפר עליכם לטהר אתכם מכל  
השאתים לפני יהוה תטהרו: שבת שבתון היא לכם ועניתם אחדנמשחיתכם חקת עולם

---

<sup>1</sup>William H. Shea, "Literary Form and Theological Function in Leviticus," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, DARCOM, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 134-151.

- 29 And it will be<sup>1</sup> for you an enduring statute. In the seventh month on the tenth of the month, you must afflict yourselves, and you must not do any work: the native and the alien who sojourns among you.
- 30 Because on this day atonement will be made for you,<sup>2</sup> to cleanse you. You shall be clean from all your sins before Yahweh.
- 31 It<sup>3</sup> [will be] a solemn sabbath for you, and you must afflict your souls. [It is] an enduring statute.

Lev 16:32-34 returns to the theme of vss. 1-28 by summarizing the role of the priest on the Day of Atonement.

Lev 16:29 discusses the relationship of the native and the alien to the observance of the Day of Atonement, and thus may be subject to the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. It has been argued that only the Israelite is commanded to afflict himself in Lev 16:29a and that the alien is prohibited from working in vs. 29b only because of the disruption that such work would bring to the Israelite

---

<sup>1</sup>In an assimilation to Lev 16:34, the LXX, followed by Pseudo-Targum Jonathan and the Vulgate, adds **τοῦτο** ("this").

<sup>2</sup>The Massoretic text points **כַּפֵּר** as **יְכַפֵּר** (the Piel—"one shall make atonement for you") rather than as **יִכַּפֵּר** (the Pual—"it shall be atoned" or "atonement shall be made"). However, in English the impersonal construction is often best translated into the passive.

<sup>3</sup>In agreement with the masculine gender of **יוֹם** ("day") the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Targum read **הוּא** instead of **הִיא**.

community.<sup>1</sup> The alien would thus not be as directly involved in the observance of the day as the native Israelite and would only be involved at all so as not to distract the Israelite community. However, it is an artificial contrivance to apply the qualification **הנר בתוכם** ("the native and the alien who sojourns among you") only to the prohibition **וכל מלאכה לא תעשו** ("and you must not do any work") and not to the immediately preceding command, **העני את נפשתיכם** ("you must afflict yourselves").<sup>2</sup>

The circumcised alien is in view in Lev 16:29, because the discussion of the native and the alien here is closely associated with the reference to making atonement for "all the people of the assembly" (**כל עם הקהל**) in vs. 33, and this expression includes only Israelites and assimilated aliens (Deut 23:3-8 [vss. 4-9, Hebrew]).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Levine, 109.

<sup>2</sup>Just as it would be an artificial contrivance to include all the dependents listed in Exod 20:10b in the command not to work on the Sabbath in Exod 20:10a, but then exclude them from the permission to work on the other six days in Exod 20:9.

<sup>3</sup>Note the parallel use of the expression "all the congregation of Israel" (**כל עדת ישראל**) to designate only Israelites and assimilated aliens in Exod 12:47, 48. See above, p. 167. The term **גר** or "alien" is used to include both the circumcised and the uncircumcised alien in passages such as Lev 18:26, 27. On the other hand, the use of this term to refer specifically to the circumcised alien in Lev 16:29 may be paralleled in passages such as Lev 17:15.



The reason why the Israelites are to afflict themselves and to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement is that it is the day when atonement is to be made (Lev 16:30). In view of the destruction of the temple, there is certainly a tradition in Judaism that it is the day itself that atones, quite apart from any ritual that might be

---

Lev 18:26 forbids the native and the alien alike from committing the sexual sins listed in the chapter, כִּי אֶת־כָּל־הַתּוֹעֵבָה הָאֵל עָשׂוּ אֲנִשֵּׁי־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵיכֶם וְחַטָּאת הָאָרֶץ ("because the people of the land who [are] before you have done all these abominations, and the land has become defiled" [vs. 27]). The present occupants of the land are not a part of Israel, yet their actions have still led to the land becoming defiled. Accordingly, the preservation of the land from defilement under Israelite occupation must also be a responsibility of all its inhabitants, uncircumcised aliens included.

Lev 17:15 forbids both the native and the alien from eating נבלה or an animal that has died of itself, whereas Deut 14:21 forbids it only to the Israelite, permitting it to be given to the alien. It has been argued that these two passages "stand in open contradiction to each other." Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 230. On the other hand, Judaism has traditionally resolved the conflict by identifying the alien in Lev 17:15 with the ger saddiq, the "righteous alien" who has been circumcised, and the alien in Deut 14:21 with the ger toshab, the uncircumcised "sojourning alien" who is a newcomer to Jewish territory, but not to the Jewish religion. Moore, 1:339, 340. This distinction between the ger saddiq and the ger toshab is sometimes drawn arbitrarily. See above, p. 125. However, in the context of Lev 17:15 and Deut 14:21 it may have some validity. "The variation in the prohibition could be due to the changed situation. In Deuteronomy Moses prepared the people for the situation in Canaan, where they would not yet be integrated into Israelite culture. In Leviticus the alien comes within the culture of Israel and has the benefits of adhering to that culture." Earl S. Kalland, "Deuteronomy," *EBC*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs., 1992), 3:101. See also Harrison, *Leviticus*, 183.

performed on it.<sup>1</sup> However, in Lev 16:30, one would then expect to read the personal **כִּי הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִכָּפֵר** ("because this day atones") rather than the impersonal **כִּי בַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִכָּפֵר** ("because on this day atonement is made"). Furthermore, Lev 16:1-28, 32-34 makes it clear that the priest himself makes atonement through the ritual he performs in the sanctuary (as in vss. 1-28; Exod 30:10). In other words, the command in Lev 16:29-31 to afflict oneself and to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement is clearly dependent upon the sanctuary ritual described in the rest of Lev 16. Lev 16 thus contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, according to Lev 16 the duties of the circumcised alien on the Day of Atonement are the same as the native Israelite's, but it does not describe the duties of the uncircumcised alien. It also pictures the observance of the Day of Atonement as depending upon the continued operation of the sanctuary.

---

<sup>1</sup>See m. Yoma 8:8 quoted above, p. 36, n. 4.

<sup>2</sup>On the temporal relativity of the sanctuary ritual in the Pentateuch, see above pp., 70-76.

Lev 23:26-32

The instructions about the Day of Atonement in Lev 23:26-32 follow immediately after the instructions about the Festival of Trumpets in vss. 23, 24, and constitute the fourth divine speech in Lev 23. Lev 23:27 gives the date of the Day of Atonement, assigns it its status as a **מקרא קדש** ("holy time"), and commands self-affliction and the presentation of an **אשה** or "generous gift" to Yahweh. Vs. 28 adds:

**וכל-מלאכה לא תעשו בעצם היום הזה כי יום כפרים הוא לכם לפני יהוה  
אלהיכם**

And you must not do any work on this same day, because it [is] a Day of Atonement, to atone on your behalf before Yahweh your God.

Lev 23:29 warns of the cutting off of anyone who does not afflict himself on the Day of Atonement, and vs. 30 of the destruction of anyone who does any work on this day, while vs. 31 affirms that this prohibition against work is a **חקת עולם** ("enduring statute"). Vs. 32 concludes:

**שבת שבתין הוא לכם ועניתם את-נפשתיכם בחשעה לחרש בערב מערב ער-ערב השבת  
שבתכם**

It [is] a solemn Sabbath for you, and you must afflict yourselves on the ninth of the month in the evening;<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In a case of haplography, some Massoretic manuscripts, followed by the LXX and the Vulgate, omit the phrase **בערב** ("in the evening").

from evening until evening you must rest<sup>1</sup> [on] your Sabbath.

Like Lev 16:29, 30, Lev 23:28 states that no work is to be done on the Day of Atonement, precisely because it is the day when atonement is made.<sup>2</sup> In other words, like Lev 16:29, 30, Lev 23:28 intrinsically links the observance of the Day of Atonement to the sacrificial cultus, and thus contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

#### Lev 25:8-10

Lev 25:8-10 states that the year of the Jubilee is to be consecrated by the blowing of the ram's horn on the Day of Atonement. However, it does not provide any

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the Hiphil השכיתו ("you must make rest") instead of the Qal השכחו ("you must rest").

<sup>2</sup>In the hypothesis that the Day of Atonement itself atones (see above, p. 202), the expression יום כפרים in Lev 23:30 would have to be read in terms of an adverbial genitive of effect (i.e., as "a day that causes atonement/purgations"). However, elsewhere in the Old Testament, whenever the word יום ("day") is followed by a genitive of verbal action, a temporal genitive is clearly in view. E.g., Isa 22:5; Jer 12:3. Accordingly, the expression יום כפרים in Lev 23:30 should also be read in terms of temporal genitive (i.e., as "a day when atonement is made"). For more information on the temporal genitive and the adverbial genitive of effect, see Waltke and O'Connor, 144-146.

criteria to establish whether the Day of Atonement is permanent or temporary.

Num 29:7-11

The instructions about the Day of Atonement in Num 29:7-11 follow immediately after the instructions about the Festival of Trumpets in Num 29:1-6. They prescribe the burnt offering for the day in detail, but do not clarify the issue of whether the day is for the offering or the offering for the day. Accordingly, this passage does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Day of Atonement is permanent or temporary.

The Festival/Feast of Ingathering/Booths

Exod 23:16b

The list of "pilgrim feasts" in Exod 23:14-17 includes mention of the Feast of Ingathering in vs. 16b:

וחג האסיף בצאת השנה באספך את-מעשיך מן השדה

And [you must keep] the Feast of Ingathering at the going out of the year when you harvest your labors from the field.

If the Feast of Ingathering is an agricultural festival, no observance of it would be expected in the nomadic conditions of the wilderness. There would thus be a geographic limitation on the observance of this feast in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for

its observance. However, it is "possible that the name simply designated the general time period in which the festival was held, rather than the event being celebrated."<sup>1</sup> There is insufficient information in Exod 23:16b to settle this issue.

Exod 34:22b

The third "pilgrim feast" listed in Exod 34:21-24 is the "Feast of Ingathering" in vs. 22b. As in Exod 23:16b, there is insufficient information in Exod 34:22b to decide whether the name "Feast of Ingathering" designates the time this feast is held or the event being celebrated.

Lev 23:33-36, 39-43

Immediately following the instructions about the Day of Atonement in Lev 23:26-32 come the instructions about the Feast of Booths in vss. 33-36, 39-43 as part of the fifth divine speech in Lev 23.

Lev 23:33-36 dates the Feast, designates the first and eighth days as holy times when no servile work is to be done, and commands that the people offer an תָּמִיד or "generous gift" each day. Lev 23:37, 38 then provides a concluding summary statement for the entire list of annual

---

<sup>1</sup>W. R. Scott, "The Booths of Ancient Israel's Autumn Festival" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1993), 44.

festivals in vss. 4-36. Finally, Lev 23:39-43 gives a supplementary exposition of the Feast of Booths.

Lev 23:33-36 does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Feast of Booths is permanent or temporary. Accordingly, the focus in this study is on vss.

39-43:

אך בחמשה עשר יום לחדש השביעי באספכם אתהבואת הארץ תחנו אתהגדירהוה שנעת  
 ימים ביום הראשון שבתון וביום השמיני שבתון: ולקחתם לכם ביום הראשון פרי עץ  
 הדר כפת תמרים וענף עץ-עבת וערבי-נחל ושמתם לפני יהוה אלהיכם שבעת ימים:  
 וחתם אתו חנ ליהוה שבעת ימים בשנה חקת עולם לדדתיכם בחדש השביעי תחנו אתו:  
 בסכת השבו שבעת ימים כלדאזרח בישראל ישבו בסכת: למען ידעו דדתיכם כי בסכת  
 הושבתי אתיבני ישראל בהוציא אותם מארץ מצרים אני יהוה אלהיכם

- 39 Yes, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you gather in the produce of the land, you must celebrate the feast of Yahweh for seven days. On the first day [will be] a Sabbath and on the eighth day [will be] a Sabbath.
- 40 On the first day you must take the splendid fruit of the trees, such as bits of a palm tree and a bough of a branchy tree<sup>1</sup> and poplars of inheritance, and you must rejoice before Yahweh your God for seven days.
- 41 You must celebrate it as a feast to Yahweh for seven days<sup>2</sup> each year [as] an enduring statute throughout your generations: in the seventh month you must celebrate it as a feast.
- 42 You must live in booths for seven days. Everyone who is a native in Israel must live in booths,
- 43 so that your generations may know that I caused the Children of Israel to live in booths when I brought them out of the land of Egypt. I am Yahweh your God.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to the use of the plural in the next phrase when it reads **וענפי עץ עבת** ("and boughs of a branchy tree") instead of **ענף עץ עבת** ("a bough of a branchy tree").

<sup>2</sup>In a case of haplography, the LXX does not translate the clause **והחתם אתו חנ ליהוה שבעת ימים** ("and you must celebrate it as a feast to Yahweh for seven days").

The stated purpose of the Feast of Booths is to memorialize the fact that Yahweh caused the Children of Israel to live in booths when he brought them out of Egypt. This feast is thus implicitly presented as being instituted only after the Exodus, so that a *prima facie* case exists that it is temporary in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

The native Israelite is required to live in booths precisely because these dwelling places commemorate the wilderness period (Lev 23:42, 43), and by implication the alien is not required to do so, since he does not share in this aspect of Israel's history. Certainly, there is no prohibition here against uncircumcised aliens observing the feast, if they so desire. However, Lev 23:42, 43 does not have a universalistic thrust, and thus contains a limitation in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.

Lev 23:39 dates the Feast of Booths in relationship to the ingathering of the produce of the land but does not indicate whether it is a celebration of this ingathering. On the other hand, the list of materials to be taken to build the booths in Lev 23:40 presupposes settled agricultural conditions. These booths are thus not an



exact replica of the wilderness dwellings, which elsewhere are simply described as tents.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, they not only commemorate the wilderness experience of the past, but also serve as reminders that Israel is now partaking of the promised inheritance. There is thus a joining together of the themes of history and agriculture, as with the Feast of Weeks in Deut 26:1-11. Certainly, no commemoration of Israel's wilderness dwellings would be necessary until after the wilderness experience has passed. Lev 23:40 thus contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In conclusion, Lev 23:39-43 pictures the Feast of Booths as being instituted as a specific memorial of the Exodus. It requires that only the native-born Israelite live in a booth at this time and stresses its agricultural nature.

#### Num 29:12-38

The instructions about the Feast of Booths in Num 29:12-38 follow immediately after the instructions about the Day of Atonement in Num 29:7-11. They prescribe the

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice the use of the word **אֹהֶל** ("tent") for the wilderness dwellings in Exod 16:16; 18:7; 33:8, 10; Lev 14:8; Num 11:10; 16:26, 27; 24:5; Deut 1:27; 5:30 (vs. 27, Hebrew); 11:6; 33:18. See Wigram, 27, 28.

burnt offerings for the feast in detail, but do not clarify the issue of whether the feast is for the offering or the offering for the feast. Accordingly, this passage does not provide any indicators of whether the Feast of Booths is permanent or temporary.

Deut 16:13-15

Immediately following the instructions about the Feast of Weeks in Deut 16:9-12 come the instructions about the Feast of Booths in vss. 13-15:

חג הסוכות תעשה לך שבועת ימים באספך מנרגך ומיקבך: ושמחת בחנך אתה ובנך ובתך  
ועבדך ואמתך והלוי והגר והיתום והאלמנה אשר בשעריך: שבועת ימים תחג ליהוה  
אלהיך במקום אשר יבחר יהוה כי יברכך יהוה אלהיך בכל תבואתך ובכל מעשה ידך  
והיית אך שמח

- 13 You must observe the Feast of Booths for seven days when you gather in from your threshing-floor and your vat.
- 14 You must rejoice in your feast: you, and your son, and your daughter, and your male servant,<sup>1</sup> and your female servant, and the Levite, and the alien, and the fatherless, and the widow who [is] in your gates.
- 15 For seven days you must celebrate a feast to Yahweh your God in the place that Yahweh<sup>2</sup> chooses, because Yahweh your God will bless you through all your

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX and the Vulgate, omits the connective waw before עבדך ("your servant"), while Pseudo-Targum Jonathan omits any translation of עבדך.

<sup>2</sup>In an assimilation to the rest of vs. 15, some Massoretic manuscripts, followed by the Vulgate and some LXX manuscripts, add אלהיך ("your God") after יהוה ("Yahweh").

produce and through all the labor of your hands,<sup>1</sup>  
and you must indeed be joyful.

In Deut 16 the ingathering of the harvest not only defines the general time of the feast (vs. 12), it is also the stated reason for rejoicing: "because Yahweh your God will bless you through all your produce and through all the labor of your hands."<sup>2</sup> No observance of the feast would thus be expected under the nomadic conditions of the wilderness, and thus Deut 16:12-15 contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

Deut 16:14 includes the גֵּר or alien in the celebration of the Feast of Booths, just as vs. 11 includes the גֵּר in the celebration of the Feast of Weeks. As van Houten observes:

The list of participants for both feasts is strictly parallel, the only difference being that in Deut. 16.11 the Levites are described as, "those living in your towns", while in Deut. 16.14 there is no modifying phrase. The participants for both include, "you, your son, your daughter, your menservants, your

---

<sup>1</sup>Some Massoretic manuscripts have the singular יָד ("your hand") instead of the plural יָדַי ("your hands").

<sup>2</sup>Vs. 15. In support of his thesis that the Feast of Booths is not an agricultural festival, Scott translates this clause as a purpose clause rather than a causal clause: "so that YHWH your God may bless you in all your produce and in all the work of your hands." Scott, 25. Emphasis mine. However, he nowhere defends his translation of וְ as a conjunction of purpose, nor is it defensible.

maidservants, the Levite, the alien, the fatherless, and the widow."<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, the uncircumcised alien in Deut 16:14 is to be included in the observance of the Feast of Booths, just as in the observance of the Feast of Weeks in Deut 16:11. Likewise, in view of Deut 16:16, the injunction of vs. 14 is permissive and idealistic rather than obligatory, just like the injunction of vs. 11.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, Deut 16:13-15 stresses the agricultural nature of the Feast of Booths. It encourages but does not insist on the participation of the uncircumcised alien.

#### Deut 31:10-13

Deut 31:9 records the writing and deposition of the law. Vss. 10-13 add:

ויצו משה אותם לאמר מקץ שבע שנים במער שנת השמיטה בחג הסוכות: בבוא כל-  
ישראל לראות את פני יהוה אלהיך במקום אשר יבחר תקרא אתה תורה הזאת נגד כל-  
ישראל באזניהם: הקהל אתהעם האנשים והנשים והטף ונרך אשר בשעריך למען ישמעו  
ולמען ילמדו ויראו את יהוה אלהיכם ושמרו לעשות את כל דברי התורה הזאת: ובניהם  
אשר לא ירדו ישמעו ולמדו ליראה את יהוה אלהיכם כל הימים אשר אתם חיים על  
הערמה אשר אתם עברים את ירדן שמה לרשתה

- 10 And Moses commanded them [the priests and elders of vs. 9], saying, "At the end of seven years, at the appointed time in the Year of Release, at the Feast of Booths,

---

<sup>1</sup>van Houten, 89.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 190.

- 11 when all Israel comes to see the face of Yahweh<sup>1</sup> your God in the place that he chooses,<sup>2</sup> you must read<sup>3</sup> this law in the hearing of all Israel.<sup>4</sup>
- 12 Gather the people: the men and the women and the children and your stranger who [is] in your gates, so that they may listen and learn and reverence Yahweh your God,<sup>5</sup> and be careful to observe all the words of this law.
- 13 Their children who do not know must hear and must learn to reverence Yahweh your God<sup>6</sup> all the days that you are living upon the land that you<sup>7</sup> are crossing over the Jordan to inherit.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the ל plus Niphal infinitive לִהְרָאוֹת, leading to the translation, "to appear before Yahweh," instead of the ל plus Qal infinitive לִרְאוֹת, leading to the translation, "to see the face of Yahweh."

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch has the perfect בָּחַר ("has chosen") instead of the imperfect יִבְחַר ("chooses").

<sup>3</sup>The rendering ἀναγγεῖσθε in most LXX manuscripts reflects the plural reading תִּקְרָאוּ instead of the singular תִּקְרֵא. The Samaritan Pentateuch has יִקְרֵא (literally, "one must read"), an impersonal construction best translated into English by a passive (i.e., "this law must be read").

<sup>4</sup>Literally, "before all Israel in their ears."

<sup>5</sup>Many Massoretic manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by some LXX manuscripts, have the third person plural אֱלֹהֵיהֶם ("their God") instead of the second person plural אֱלֹהֵיכֶם ("your God").

<sup>6</sup>Many Massoretic manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the Syriac and the Vulgate, have the third person plural אֱלֹהֵיהֶם ("their God") rather than the second person plural אֱלֹהֵיכֶם ("your God"). Codex Vaticanus clearly reads the second singular אֱלֹהֶיךָ ("your God") and the codex Basiliano-Vaticanus clearly reads the first plural אֱלֹהֵינוּ ("our God").

<sup>7</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX and the Vulgate, has the third person הֵם ("they") instead of the second person אַתָּם ("you").

Deut 31:11, 12 includes the נָכְרִי or alien in the observance of the Feast of Booths each seventh year, and given his listing with the dependent children, the uncircumcised alien would be involved, just as in Deut 16:14. Presumably the alien's attendance is permissive and idealistic rather than obligatory, just as in Deut 16:14. Deut 31:10-13 is thus relevant to the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. However, it does not add anything to what is affirmed in Deut 16:14.

#### The Sabbatical Year

##### Exod 21:2

Exod 21:2-11 is "a kind of miscellany under the general topic 'the treatment of one's slaves,' with guidance concerning the treatment of both male (vv 2-6) and female (vv 7-11) slaves."<sup>1</sup> Vs. 2 speaks of a six-year/seventh year cycle, which should be identified with the cycle of the Sabbatical Year:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Durham, 320.

<sup>2</sup>Nahum Sarna notes that according to rabbinic tradition, the seventh year is the seventh year of the slave's indenture. However, he also correctly notes that the according to Targum Jonathan 21:7; 22:2, the Sabbatical Year/Year of Release is in view. See Nahum M. Sarna, Exodus שמות, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 119. The latter position is adopted here because an analysis of the literary structure of Exod 20:22-23:19 shows that "the laws of emancipation in

כי חקנה עבר עברי שש שנים יעבר ובשבעה יצא לחמשי חנם

When you acquire a Hebrew slave, he is to serve<sup>1</sup> for six years, but in the seventh he may go free for nothing.

Exod 21:2-11 does not explicitly address the question of the rights of the non-Hebrew slave. However, the fact that Exod 21:3 speaks specifically of the rights of the Hebrew slave suggests that here there is a limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.<sup>2</sup>

---

Exod 21:2-11, with the fundamental condition of a six-year period of slavery and manumission in the seventh year . . . correspond to the prescription of the fallow year of Exod 23:10, 11 (six years cultivation, in the seventh year natural growth), to which the rest-day stipulation of Exod 23:12 with its six-seventh rhythm . . . is directly connected." "Die Freilassungsgesetze 21,2-11 mit der Grundkondition [sic] 6-jähriger Dienstzeit und manumissio im je 7. Jahr . . . korrespondieren der Brachjahrenvorschrift 23,10-11 (6 Jahre Anbau, im 7. Jahr Wildwuchs), der sich unmittelbar die Ruhetagsbestimmung 23,12 mit ihrem Sechsen-Siebenerrhythmus . . . verbindet." Jörn Halbe, Das Privilegrecht Jahwes: Ex 34, 10-26 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), 421, 422. See also Innocenzo Cardellini, Die biblischen „Sklaven“-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts: Ein Beitrag zur Tradition, Überlieferung und Redaktion der alttestamentlichen Rechtstexte, Bonner biblische Beiträge, vol. 55 (Königstein: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1981), 245.

<sup>1</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch is widely supported by the LXX, the Syriac, and the Vulgate in adding the second person masculine singular suffix to the verb **יעבר**, leading to the translation, "he is to serve you."

<sup>2</sup>On the use of the phrase "Hebrew slave" (**עבר עברי**) to designate an Israelite rather than a non-Israelite slave, see below, p. 228, n. 1.

Exod 23:10-12

The list of sacred times in Exod 23:10-17 begins with the Sabbatical Year in vss. 10, 11:<sup>1</sup>

ושש שנים תזרע את הארץ ואספת את תבואתה: והשביעית תשמיטה ונשטתה ואכלו אביני עמך ויתרם תאכל חית השדה כן תעשה לכרמך ליתך

- 10 And for six years you may sow your land and gather its produce.
- 11 However, in the seventh [year] you must release it and leave it, and the poor of your people may eat it, and what they do not eat, the beast of the field may eat. So must you do with your vineyard [and] with your olive grove.<sup>2</sup>

The reference to the sowing of the land and the gathering of the produce implies settled agricultural conditions, and accordingly, Exod 23:10, 11 contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

"The six-year seven-year scheme" in Exod 23:10, 11 furnishes "a stichwortliche [sic; should be stichwörtliche] association for the six days-seventh day contrast of verse

---

<sup>1</sup>For evidence that the seventh year of Exod 23:11 is the Sabbatical Year rather than the seventh of a series of years, see above, p. 215, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Many Massoretic manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the Syriac and the Vulgate, complete the sense of the verse by adding the connective waw ("and") before ליתך ("with your olive grove").



12."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, when vs. 12 differs from vss. 10, 11, it distinctly underscores some of the differences between the weekly Sabbath and the Sabbatical Year. On the weekly Sabbath people and animals are to rest (Exod 23:12) while in the seventh year the land is to rest (vs. 10). Likewise, on the weekly Sabbath the head of the household is to rest so that (למען) others might also rest (vs. 12), while in the seventh year the landowner's obligations to the needy and to animals are merely incidental to the resting of the land, as indicated by the absence of למען in vs. 11.<sup>2</sup> The connection between the Sabbatical Year and the land is thus reinforced.

There is no indication of whether the observance of the Sabbatical Year is only restricted to the land of Israel or whether it is intended to apply in other agricultural settings as well.

---

<sup>1</sup>Kiker, 90.

<sup>2</sup>It is true that in Exod 23:11, the waw consecutive in the expression ואכלו ("and they may eat") may theoretically be a consequential waw of addition. See Jacques Doukhan, Hebrew for Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), 180. In this case, the expression would be equivalent to the purpose clause, למען יאכלו ("so that they may eat"). See Hartley, 430; Kaiser, "Exodus," 444; Thompson, Deuteronomy, 186. However, given the stichwortliche association between vs. 11 and vs. 12, both verses would be expected to express purpose in the same way.

Lev 25:2-7, 20-22

Lev 25:2-55 has appropriately been designated as "legislation concerning seven-year cycles."<sup>1</sup> Vss. 2-7 and vss. 20-22 give instruction about the Sabbatical Year, and vss. 8-12, 20-22 give instruction about the Jubilee.

Lev 25:20-22 does not provide any criteria to establish whether the Sabbatical Year is permanent or temporary. Accordingly, the focus in this study is on vss. 2-7:

דבר אל־בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם כי תבאו אל־הארץ אשר אני נתן לכם ושבתה הארץ  
שבתה ליהוה: שש שנים תזרע שָׂרָךְ ושש שנים תזמר כִּרְמְךָ ואספת את־תבואתה: ובשנה  
השביעי שבת שבתון יהיה לארץ שבת ליהוה שָׂרָךְ לא תזרע וכרמך לא תזמר: את ספיח  
קצירך לא תקצור ואח־ענבי נזירך לא תבצר שנת שבתון יהיה לארץ: והיתה שבת הארץ  
לכם לאכלה לך ולעבדך ולאמתך ולשכירך ולתושבך הנרים עמך: ולבהמתך ולחיה  
אשר בארצך תהיה כל־תבואתה לאכל

- 2 Speak to the Children of Israel and say to them,  
"When you come to the land that I am giving you,  
the land must have a Sabbath to Yahweh.
- 3 For six years you may sow your field, and for six  
years you may prune your vineyard and gather in the  
produce.
- 4 However, in the seventh year the land must have a  
solemn rest, a Sabbath to Yahweh. You must not sow  
your field, and you must not prune your vineyard.
- 5 You must not harvest the growth from the spilled  
kernels<sup>2</sup> of your harvest, and you must not gather

---

<sup>1</sup>Hartley, 422.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the LXX and the Syriac, has the connective waw ("and") before the definite marker, אֵל. Likewise, the Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by the Targum, assimilates to vs. 11 in having the plural ספִּיחִי instead of the singular ספִּיחַ. For the translation of the word ספִּיחַ as "growth from spilled kernels," see Koehler and Baumgartner, 664.

- from the fruit of your unfettered vine.<sup>1</sup> The land must have a year of rest.
- 6 You will have the Sabbath [produce] of the land for food: you, and your male servant, and your female servant, and your hired hand, and your sojourner<sup>2</sup> (the aliens with you),
- 7 and your cattle, and the beast on your land. All its produce will be for food.

Lev 25:6 clearly notes the rights of the sojourner and of the aliens who live with Israel to share in the food the land produces in the Sabbatical Year, and accordingly, there seems to be no limitation in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. However, since it is the land that must rest rather than the people, this provision of food for the alien may be just as incidental to the purpose of the Sabbatical Year as is the provision of food for the needy of the land and the animals in Exod 23:11.

Lev 25:2 presupposes entrance into the land, while the reference to "your field" in vs. 3 further "assumes individual possession of land parcels, which could not take place until a process of conquest and distribution had been

---

<sup>1</sup>Some Massoretic manuscripts have נִירֶיךָ ("your unfettered vines") rather than נִיר ("your unfettered vine"). On the translation of נִיר see *ibid.*, 604.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch assimilates to the plural form גֵּרִים ("aliens") when it uses the plural forms of all the nouns from עֶבֶד ("male servant") through to חֹשֶׁב ("sojourner").

accomplished."<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Lev 25:2, 3, like Exod 23:10, contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

Lev 26:34, 35, 43

Lev 26 lists the blessings of obedience to the covenant (vss. 1-13) and the penalties of disobedience (vss. 14-45). One of the penalties of disobedience is the desolation of the land and the exile of the people (vss. 32, 33). Vss. 34, 35 add:

או תרצה הארץ אחשבתיה כל ימי השמה ואתם בארץ איביכם או תשבת הארץ  
והרצת אתשבתיה: כל ימי השמה תשבת את אשר לאשבתה בשבתיהם בשבתכם  
עליה

- 34 Then the land will enjoy her Sabbaths all the days of the desolation,<sup>2</sup> but you [will be] in the land of your enemies. Then the land will rest and pay off her Sabbaths.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Roy Gane, "The Laws of the Seventh and Fiftieth Years," Journal of the Association of Graduate Near Eastern Students 1 (1990): 3.

<sup>2</sup>Both here in vs. 34 and in vs. 35, the Samaritan Pentateuch reads אשמה instead of השמה, while the LXX clearly reads the final ה as a third person singular feminine suffix (i.e., "her desolation"). See Hartley, 455.

<sup>3</sup>On the translation of the Hiphil of רצה as "pay off," see BDB, 953. The Samaritan Pentateuch has the more updated והרצתה, rather than the archaic והרצת. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 210; Hartley, 455. In a case of haplography, the Targum omits any translation of the words הארץ והרצת את.

- 35 All the days of the desolation she will rest, for those of your Sabbaths she did not observe while you lived upon her.

Lev 26:36-39 predicts the fate of the survivors, while vss. 40-45 look towards restoration beyond the desolation. In vs. 43, the specific focus on the Sabbatical Year is resumed:

והארץ תעזוב מהם ותריץ ארשבתחיה בהשמה מהם והם ירצו ארעונם יען וביען במשפטי מאסו ואחרקתי געלה נפשם

And the land shall be abandoned by them, that she may enjoy<sup>1</sup> her Sabbaths during her desolation<sup>2</sup> without them.<sup>3</sup> However, they will pay for their iniquity, because<sup>4</sup> they have rejected my judgments, and their soul has abhorred my statutes.

Lev 26:34, 35, 43 stresses the special relationship between the Sabbatical Year and the land, and accordingly contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance. According to the Prophets, exile or other disasters sometimes interrupt the

---

<sup>1</sup>In an assimilation to its reading of Lev 26:34b, the Samaritan Pentateuch here has the Hiphil ורצתה instead of the Qal ותריץ.

<sup>2</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch reads אשמה instead of השמה, just as in vs. 34.

<sup>3</sup>The preposition מן is here used privatively.

<sup>4</sup>The repetition of יען ("because") gives extra emphasis. See Hartley, 456. The Samaritan Pentateuch omits the connective waw before ביען.

observance of other sacred times.<sup>1</sup> However, according to Lev 26, it is exile that ensures that the Sabbatical Years are observed, albeit belatedly.<sup>2</sup> This dissimilarity in turn may be related to the observation that the Sabbatical Year is primarily a sabbath for the land rather than for the people. The contrast between land and people is reinforced by the use of the pronoun **אֲנִי** ("but you") instead of the verb at the beginning of the second clause in Lev 26:34, and by the similar use of **אָנֹכִי** ("however, they") at the beginning of the third clause in Lev 26:43.<sup>3</sup>

#### Deut 15:1-18

Deut 15:1-11 gives instructions concerning the observance of "the Year of Release" (**שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה**—vs. 9) once every seven years, when it is commanded that all debts owed by fellow Israelites are to be remitted. Deut 15:12-18 commands the freeing of the Hebrew slave once every seven years. Attention is given to each of these passages in turn.

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, pp. 271-301.

<sup>2</sup>See also 2 Chr 36:21, where the fulfillment of the prediction of Lev 26:34, 35, 43 is recorded.

<sup>3</sup>For more information on the function of the contrasting waw of opposition, see Doukhan, Hebrew for Theologians, 180.

Deut 15:1-11

The Year of Release should be identified with the Sabbatical Year, since it clearly comes to the whole community at fixed periodic intervals. Deut 15:9 warns against refusing to lend to the poor just because the Year of Release is near, and this warning is intelligible only if the year is part of a general cycle, rather than the seventh year since a debt was first incurred. Likewise, a communal aspect is evident in Deut 31:10-13, which commands that each Year of Release all Israel be gathered to hear the law read at the Feast of Booths.

It should be noted that Deut 15:1-3 requires only the release of the fellow Israelite's debt, and not the release of the foreigner's debt:

מִקֵּץ שִׁבְע־שָׁנִים תַּעֲשֶׂה שְׁמִטָּה: וְזֶה דְּבַר הַשְּׁמִטָּה שְׁמוּטָה כָּל־בֶּעַל מִשָּׁה יָדוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂה  
לֹא בִרְעָה יִנָּשׂ אֶת רֵעֵהוּ וְאֶת אֲחִיו כִּי קָרָא שְׁמִטָּה לַיהוָה: אֶת הַנֹּכְרִי תִנָּשׂ וְאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה לָךְ  
אֶת־אֲחִיךָ תִּשְׁמַט יָרֵךְ

- 1 At the end of seven years you must grant a release.
- 2 This [is] the instruction for the release: Everyone who is owed anything by his neighbor<sup>1</sup> must grant a release. He must not exact payment from his

---

<sup>1</sup>Literally, "every owner of the loan of his hand that he lends to his neighbor." See BDB, 674.

neighbor or his brother,<sup>1</sup> for a release to Yahweh has been proclaimed.<sup>2</sup>

- 3 From the foreigner you may exact payment, but whatever belongs to you [that is] with your brother, your hand must release.

In other words, Deut 15:1-3 contains a limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.

Deut 15:12-18

Deut 15:12-18 gives instruction about the freeing of slaves in the Sabbatical Year.<sup>3</sup> Vss. 12-15 are of

---

<sup>1</sup>In a case of haplography, the LXX omits any translation of the expression *מֵאֵת רֵעֵהוּ* ("from his neighbor"), while the phrase *וְאֵת אָחִיו* ("or his brother") is absent in some Massoretic manuscripts. Other Massoretic manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch read *מֵאֵת רֵעֵהוּ* and *אֵת אָחִיו* as appositional statements and thus omit the connective *waw* ("or").

<sup>2</sup>Literally, "for one has proclaimed a release to Yahweh." However, the Hebrew impersonal construction is here best translated into English by a passive.

<sup>3</sup>As with Exod 21:2, it has been argued that the seven years of Deut 15:12 are the years of the slave's indenture rather than the seven years of the Sabbatical cycle. In other words, "the principle . . . is the same as that underlying the sabbatical cycle, but the presence of the law in this chapter seems to be prompted by the theme of various types of needy persons . . . rather than by the legislation relating to the year of release." Craigie, 238. See also Martin Rose, *5. Mose*, vol. 1, *5. Mose 12-25: Einführung und Gesetze*, ZBAT, no. 5.1 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994), 211. However, since the slavery of the Israelite would presumably be the result of insolvency, it is only to be expected that the slave would be released at the same time as the general cancellation of debts in the Year of Release (Deut 15:1-11). See Dieter Schneider, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*, WSAT (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1982), 153. On the specific



special relevance to this study:

כִּי־מָכַר לְךָ אֶחָיו הָעִבְרִי אוֹ הָעִבְרִיָּה וְעָבַדְךָ שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים וּבִשְׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִת תִּשְׁלַחְנוּ  
חֲפָשִׁי מֵעִמְךָ: וְכִי־תִשְׁלַחְנוּ חֲפָשִׁי מֵעִמְךָ לֹא תִשְׁלַחְנוּ רֵיקָם: הָעֲנִיִּק הָעֲנִיִּק לוֹ מִצֹּאֲנֶךָ  
וּמִנֶּיֶךָ וּמִיִּקְבְּךָ אֲשֶׁר בֵּרַכְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ תִּתֵּן־לּוֹ: וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי עֶבֶר הָיִיתָ בָּאָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם  
וַיִּפְדְּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ עַל־כֵּן אִמְכִּימָצוֹךְ אֶת־הָרֶבֶר הַזֶּה הַיּוֹם

- 12 When your Hebrew brother is sold to you (or the Hebrew woman), he is to serve you for six years, but in the seventh year you must send him away from you free.
- 13 And when you send him away from you free, do not send him away empty-handed.
- 14 You must load him up with some of your produce,<sup>1</sup> and from your threshing-floor<sup>2</sup> and your wine-vat. [From] what<sup>3</sup> Yahweh<sup>4</sup> your God has blessed you [with] you must give to him.
- 15 You must remember that you were in the land of Egypt, and [that] Yahweh your God redeemed you.

---

applicability of the six-seventh rhythm of Exod 21:2 to the Sabbatical cycle, see above, p. 215, fn. 2.

<sup>1</sup>Literally, "you must put on (his) neck," the use of the infinitive absolute הָעֲנִיִּק before the finite form הָעֲנִיִּק giving extra emphasis. See Koehler and Baumgartner, 722.

<sup>2</sup>Some Massoretic manuscripts, along with a number of Targum manuscripts, omit the connective waw before מִנֶּיֶךָ ("from your threshing-floor"), evidently reading the expression מִנֶּיֶךָ וּמִיִּקְבְּךָ ("from your threshing-floor and your wine-press") as a statement standing in apposition with מִצֹּאֲנֶךָ ("from your produce").

<sup>3</sup>The Samaritan Pentateuch, followed by some LXX manuscripts, has the preposition כִּ before the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, leading to the translation "according to how" instead of "[from] what."

<sup>4</sup>The Dead Sea Scrolls have אֲרִנִּי instead of יְהוָה, an understandable substitution given the tradition of reading both titles the same way.

Therefore, I [am] commanding you<sup>1</sup> this thing today.<sup>2</sup>

Deut 15:15 gives Yahweh's redemption of his people as the reason for the command he is giving them. Accordingly, at first sight there may seem to be a limitation in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. However, the antecedent of "this thing" (אֲחִירְכִּי הַזֶּה) may be the injunction to load up the departing slave with a generous supply of produce in vss. 13, 14, rather than the observance of the Year of Release per se.

Deut 15:12-18 does not explicitly address the question of the rights of the non-Hebrew slave. However, the fact that vs. 12 speaks specifically of the rights of the Hebrew slave suggests that here there is a limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or

---

<sup>1</sup>The Dead Sea Scrolls, followed by some Septuagint manuscripts and the Targum Jonathan, add לַעֲשֵׂה ("to do") as an infinitive complement to מִצִּוְךָ ("has commanded you").

<sup>2</sup>In a case of haplography, some LXX manuscripts omit any translation of הַיּוֹם ("today").

temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.<sup>1</sup>

Deut 31:10-13

Deut 31:9 records the writing and deposition of the law, then vss. 10-13 command that at the Feast of Booths each Year of Release, the Deuteronomic law should be read before all those who have assembled for the feast.

This assembly clearly includes נָרָךְ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ ("your alien who [is] within your gates") who has come to the Feast,<sup>2</sup> and accordingly Deut 31:10-13 seems to contain no limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is

---

<sup>1</sup>Against the background of the ancient Near East, Thompson argues that "it is possible that in Deuteronomy 15 Hebrew denotes a Habiru (or Hapiru) slave and that the reference is to a foreigner normally engaged in various types of service but now fallen on bad times." Thompson, Deuteronomy, 190. However, he then adds that "it remains possible, especially in the light of Leviticus 25:39-55, that the reference is to an Israelite who has temporarily accepted a status which is virtually a slave status." Ibid. The latter option is to be preferred, for whatever the use of Habiru across the Ancient Near East, the designation עֲבָדִי ("Hebrew") in the Old Testament is never used unambiguously of anyone but Israelites, albeit "more frequently of Israelites in a foreign or slave status than in a state of freedom." Ibid., 189. The designation of "the Hebrew" in Deut 15:12 as "your brother" (אָחִיךָ) should also be read in the light of vss. 2, 3, where the brother is specifically contrasted with the foreigner. See Rose, 1:212; Gerhard von Rad, Deuteronomy: A Commentary, trans. Dorothea Barton, OTL (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1966), 107.

<sup>2</sup>Deut 31:12. For a translation of Deut 31:10-13, see above, pp. 213, 214.

permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it. On the other hand, in the larger context of Deuteronomy, the attendance of the <sup>7</sup> or alien at the Feast of Booths is clearly an ideal that is encouraged rather than a demand that is enforced.<sup>1</sup> In addition, while the ultimate purpose of this reading is to encourage those assembled to observe "all the words of this law" (vs. 12), presumably in the case of the <sup>7</sup> such observance would not include obedience to those specific parts of the law from which Deuteronomy itself elsewhere exempts him (e.g., Deut 14:21 and 15:1-18). Accordingly, Deut 31:10-13 does not provide evidence per se of the Sabbatical Year applying beyond Israel.

In Deut 31:10-13, the reading of the law each Sabbatical Year clearly presupposes the observance of the Feast of Tabernacles, and accordingly, at least as far as this practice is concerned, this passage contains a limitation in terms of the fifth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 213.

## The Jubilee

Lev 25:8-17, 23-54

The Jubilee is discussed twice in Lev 25, in vss. 8-17 and in vss. 23-54.<sup>1</sup> Attention is given to each of these two passages in turn.

## Lev 25:8-17

The basic prescription for the observance of the Jubilee is given in Lev 25:8-12:

וספרת לך שבע שבתות שנים שבע שנים שבע פעמים והיו לך ימי שבע שבתות השנים  
 חשע וארבעים שנה: והעברת שופר תרועה בחדש השבעי בעשור לחדש ביום הכפרים  
 תעבירו שופר בכל־ארצכם: וקדשתם את שנת החמישים שנה וקראתם רדור בארץ לכל־  
 יובל הוא תהיה ישביה לכם ושבתם איש אל־אחוזתו ואיש אל־משפחתו תשוב: יובל הוא  
 המשים שנה תהיה שנת לכם לא חזרעו ולא תקצרו את־ספיחיה ולא תבצרו את־זמורה:  
 כי יובל הוא קדש תהיה לכם מן־השדה תאכלו את־תבואתה

- 8 And you must reckon seven Sabbatical Years, [i.e.,] seven years seven times, and you will have a period of seven Sabbaths, [i.e.,] forty-nine years.
- 9 Then you must sound aloud a ram's horn in the seventh month on the tenth of the month. On the Day of Atonement you must sound a ram's horn throughout all your land.
- 10 You must sanctify the fiftieth year<sup>2</sup> and you must proclaim a release in the land for all its inhabitants. It<sup>3</sup> shall be a Year of Jubilee for you, and each one of you must return to his own property, and to his own clan.

---

<sup>1</sup>On the place of vss. 8-17 and vss. 23-54 within the larger structure of Lev 25, see above, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup>The noun שנה ("year") is frequently repeated when the numeral follows it as a genitive. See Gen 7:11; 2 Kgs 13:10; Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 435.

<sup>3</sup>Throughout Lev 25:8-12, the Targum has the later feminine form, היא, rather than the archaic feminine form, הוּא, found in the Massoretic text.

- 11 The fiftieth year shall be Jubilee for you. You must not sow, and you must not harvest the growth from its spilled kernels, nor cut off its unfettered growth,
- 12 because it shall be a holy Jubilee for you. You may eat its produce from the field.

This passage presupposes possession of the land and a system of ancestral land tenure, so that it contains limitations in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

According to Lev 25:8-10, the calculation of the Jubilee is based on the cycle of Sabbatical Years and the Jubilee itself is proclaimed throughout the land by the blowing of a trumpet on the Day of Atonement. The observance of the Jubilee thus presupposes the Sabbatical Year, and its proclamation ceremony presupposes the observance of the Day of Atonement. This passage thus contains limitations in terms of the fifth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times.

Lev 25:23-54

Lev 25:35-54 commands that the impoverished Israelite must not be enslaved but sold "as a hired hand" (כשכיר—vs. 40) until the Jubilee, when he is to return to

his ancestral land (vs. 41).<sup>1</sup> The reason given is that the Israelites are Yahweh's slaves whom he has brought out of Egypt (vs. 42). Accordingly, this passage appears to contain a limitation in terms of the second criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quo.

Of course, it could be argued that this reason is only a reinforcing ground for showing compassion to slaves, rather than the basis of the Jubilee per se. However, against this position, it should be noted Lev 25:23-54 does not allow for the release of the foreign slave in the Year of Jubilee. Instead, aliens and their descendants may be enslaved and passed on indefinitely from generation to generation (vss. 44-46a). This sharp contrast between the treatment of Israelite and alien constitutes a limitation in terms of the third criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who participate in observing it.

Of course, in terms of the same criterion, the alien is given a part to play in the observance of the Jubilee in Lev 25:47-54, which insists that if he has an Israelite slave, he must allow him to return to his own land in the Jubilee. However, once again the benefit of

---

<sup>1</sup>For a proposed reconciliation of these provisions with those of Deut 15:12-18, see Gane, "The Seventh and Fiftieth Years," 12, 13.

the Israelite is the goal of the commandment, rather than that of the alien.

Lev 25:23-34 commands that all unredeemed real estate should revert to the control of the original owner at the Jubilee, except for "the dwelling house of the walled city" (בֵּית מוֹשָׁב עִיר הוֹמָה—vs. 29). Clearly the Jubilee here presupposes agricultural conditions and ancestral land tenure (see also vs. 41), so this passage contains limitations in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

In conclusion, Lev 25 pictures the Exodus from Egypt as the reason for the celebration of the Jubilee, and limits its benefits to the Israelite, exclusive of the foreigner or alien. It also pictures the obligation to observe the Jubilee as being dependent upon Israel's possession of the promised land, agricultural conditions, and a system of ancestral land tenure.

#### Lev 27:16-24

Lev 27:16-24 is part of a larger body of legislation about vows in vss. 2-33 and raises the subject of the Jubilee in relationship to the dedication of farm land. It clearly presupposes the possession of the land and a system of ancestral land tenure, so that it contains



limitations in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>1</sup>

#### Num 36:1-9

Num 36:1-4 expresses concern that should Zelophehad's daughters inherit their father's land, then in the Jubilee the tribes into which they marry will inherit the land instead of their father's tribe. The solution offered in vss. 5-9 is for a daughter who inherits land to marry only within her own tribe. Both the problem and the solution presuppose a system of ancestral land tenure. Accordingly, Num 36:1-9 contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

#### Summary

On the issue of ethical versus ritual law in general, the vertical sanctuary typology of Exod 25:9, 40 implies that the earthly sanctuary and its rituals point beyond themselves to a cosmic-scale enactment, and the

---

<sup>1</sup>In terms of the same criterion, vss. 18 and 21 clearly presuppose a functioning priesthood. However, the priesthood here plays an indispensable role in the prescriptions for dedicating the land, rather than in the operation of the Jubilee system per se.

repetition of the earthly ritual cycle year after year without effecting permanent atonement implies that a cosmic-scale, effectual reality is forthcoming. The second implication is confirmed by a comparison of Gen 1-3 and Lev 16 in terms of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch as a whole—a comparison which shows that the ritual of the Mosaic tabernacle is only a temporary measure enacted until a priesthood is established offering full and permanent access to the divine presence. This variability in access is further illustrated by a comparison of the relationship between God and Israel before and after her worship of the golden calf.<sup>1</sup>

Especially in Deuteronomy, the Decalogue is set apart by certain distinctive features vis-à-vis other Pentateuchal legal formulations, such as who originally wrote it,<sup>2</sup> the material it is written on,<sup>3</sup> and where it is kept.<sup>4</sup> The tripartition of the law into moral, ceremonial, and judicial law cannot be supported from the use of three different legal terms in Deut 6:1. However, a study of

---

<sup>1</sup>On the change in the priesthood after the worship of the golden calf, compare Exod 32:26-28 and Num 3:12. On the change in the tabernacle's function as a symbol of the divine presence, compare Exod 27:21; 28:43; 29:42, 43 and Exod 33:7; 36:6-8.

<sup>2</sup>God rather than Moses. Deut 10:4; 31:9, 24.

<sup>3</sup>On stone rather than in a book. Deut 10:3; 31:24.

<sup>4</sup>In the Ark of the Covenant rather than on the side of it. Deut 10:5; 31:26.

legal terms used in Deuteronomy confirms the distinct status of the Decalogue.<sup>1</sup> The literary structure of Deut 5:2-29 sets the Decalogue apart as the fundamental statement of law that Deut 12-26 proceeds to elaborate. Likewise, the subtle differences between Deut 6:1 and Deut 12:1 suggest the historical relativization of those laws which apply throughout the wilderness period to those laws which become applicable only once Israel has entered the promised land: a relativization which is perhaps reinforced by "the Law of the Prophet" in Deut 18:9-22.

On the issue of the sacred times in particular, five possible criteria have been developed in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: criteria that relate respectively to the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time; the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding its terminus a quo; the identity of those who

---

<sup>1</sup>Deuteronomy always uses the terms חקות/חקים ("statutes"), משמרתה ("charge"), מצוה (singular), משפטים, and עדות ("testimonies") to refer to the contents of Deut 6-26, and never to the Decalogue of Deut 5. Conversely, whenever Deuteronomy speaks of law as ברית ("covenant"), it refers exclusively to the Decalogue. E.g., Deut 4:13; 5:2, 3; 9:9, 11, 15; 10:8; 17:2; 29:25 (vs. 24, Hebrew); 31:9, 16, 20, 25, 26; as opposed to Deut 29:1 (Deut 28:69, Hebrew); 29:9, 12, 14, 21 (vss. 8, 11, 13, 20, Hebrew). On the other hand, the plural מצוות ("commandments") designates either the Decalogue of Deut 5 (e.g., Deut 5:10, 29; 6:17; 7:9; 8:2; 13:5), or Moses' promulgation in Deut 6-26 (e.g., Deut 4:2, 40; 6:2; 8:6, 11; 10:13; 11:1, 13, 27, 28; 13:18 [vs. 19, Hebrew]; 26:17, 18; 28:1, 9, 13, 15, 45; 30:8, 10, 16), but never to both at once.

observe it; the constituent elements necessary for its observance; and its interrelationship with other sacred times. A summary can now be made of the evidence in the Pentateuch in terms of these five possible criteria.

The first criterion concerns the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the words עולם ("perpetuity") and דורות ("generations") are frequently used chronologically in commands to observe the various sacred times,<sup>1</sup> and this use has been cited as evidence of their perpetuity. However, these terms emphasize the incalculability of the time period during which the sacred times are to apply, rather than a lack of a terminus ad quem per se.

The second criterion concerns the canonical picture of the terminus a quo of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the Sabbath is pictured as a creation ordinance (Gen 2:1-3; Exod 20:11; 31:17). On the other hand, the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread are presented as being specifically instituted to memorialize the Exodus,<sup>2</sup> and the Feast of Booths is pictured as being introduced to commemorate the wilderness experience of the Israelites

---

<sup>1</sup>For examples of this use of the word עולם, see Exod 12:14, 17, 24; 31:16, 17; Lev 16: 29, 31, 34; 23:14, 21, 41; 24:8). For examples of this use of the word דורות, see Exod 12: 14, 17, 42; 30:10; 31:13, 16; Lev 23:14, 21, 31, 41.

<sup>2</sup>See Exod 12:14, 17, 42; 13:3; 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:1, 3.

(Lev 23:42, 43). Accordingly, a *prima facie* case exists that the Sabbath is permanent but that the Passover, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Feast of Booths are temporary.

The third criterion concerns the identity of those who observe a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, one of the reasons for Sabbath observance is to enable the uncircumcised alien and other dependent groups to rest (Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14, 15). On the other hand, the uncircumcised alien is specifically barred from observing the Passover (Exod 12:43-49). The alien is prohibited from eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 12:19, but contextually the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view. The uncircumcised alien is permitted and encouraged to observe the Festival/Feast of Harvest/Weeks (Deut 16:11, 12; 26:11), but is not required to do so (Deut 16:16). The same situation applies to alien observance of the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Lev 22:42, 43; Deut 16:14, 16). The alien is required both to humble himself and to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement in Lev 16:29, but once again the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view. In the Sabbatical Year, provision is made for the sustenance of the uncircumcised alien while the land lies fallow (Lev 25:6), and the uncircumcised alien attending the Feast of Booths is included in the

comprehensive list of people who are to listen to the reading of the law (Deut 31:11, 12). Especially in the case of the sustenance of the alien, the reason may be to ensure the survival of the landless during the fallow year. However, his debts are not then remitted as are the Israelite's, nor is the non-Israelite slave to be released after seven years, as the Israelite is (Deut 15:1-18). Likewise, in the Year of Jubilee, Israelite servants are to be released, whereas the slaves who are foreigners or the children of aliens may remain enslaved and passed on from generation to generation (Lev 25:47-54).

The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the relationship between a sacred time and the sacrificial cultus is of special interest, as is the nature of the geographical indicators associated with it.

On the issue of the sacred times and the sacrificial cultus, special sacrifices are certainly prescribed for the Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9; Num 28:9, 10). However, the Sabbath itself is presented as an institution that stands independent of the sanctuary cult (Exod 16:1, 2; 31:14, 15; Lev 23:2, 3). On the other hand, the obligation to observe the New Moon festival is presented solely in terms of the cult (Num 10:10; 28:11-15). Likewise, in Lev 23:37, the reason for the proclamation of

the annual מוערי יהוה ("festivals of Yahweh") as מקראי קדש ("holy times") is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice, and the obligation to observe these מקראי קדש as rest days would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. Passover is pictured as dependent on the continued operation of the sacrificial system in Num 9:6, 7, 13, as is the Festival of the Wavesheaf in Lev 23:14. The obligation to observe the Day of Atonement is portrayed as dependent upon the continued operation of the tripartite sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

On the issue of the sacred times and geographic indicators, the Sabbath is pictured as a temple in time applicable both in the wilderness and in the promised land.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the temporary nature of three festivals is suggested by the fact that they become applicable only once Israel has entered the land: the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:10-14), the Feast of the Harvest/Weeks (Lev 23:22; Deut 26:1-11), and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Lev 23:40; Deut 16:12-15). Likewise, the Sabbatical Year presupposes the possession and division of the land (Exod 23:10, 11; Lev 25:3; 26: 24, 25, 43) and the Jubilee presupposes a system of ancestral land tenure

---

<sup>1</sup>Lev 16:30-34 compared with Exod 30:10; Lev 16:1-28. See also Lev 23:28.

<sup>2</sup>Gen 2:1-3; Exod 16:1, 2; Exod 31:14, 15; Num 15:32-36.

(Lev 25:8-17, 23-34, 41; 27:16-24; Num 36:1-9). Three passages call for the centralized observance of Passover/ Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Harvest/Weeks, and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:1-16). However, the flexibility over the issue of centralization in the Pentateuch itself suggests that centralization cannot be assumed to be a necessary prerequisite for their observance (Lev 17:4; Deut 12:10, 11, 15). The Egyptian Passover in Exod 12 is observed without a central shrine, but this aspect of the first Passover may not be meant as a model for future Passover observance. On the other hand, space is emphasized above time in the provision of Num 9:9-14 for Israelites on a distant journey to celebrate Passover a month later than normal.

The fifth criterion concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times. In terms of this criterion, the Feast of Unleavened Bread is an extension of the Passover (Deut 16:3), just as the Feast of Harvest/Weeks is an extension of the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:15). The Festival of Trumpets is also a preparation for the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (vss. 23-25), and the Jubilee presupposes the observance of the cycle of Sabbatical Years (Lev 25:8, 9). Likewise, it is proclaimed by the blowing of a trumpet on the Day of Atonement (vs. 9), so that at



least this feature of the Year of Jubilee presupposes the continued observance of the Day of Atonement.

## CHAPTER III

### THE EXTENT OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE PENTATEUCHAL SACRED TIMES IN THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

In this chapter a search is undertaken for Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times found outside the Pentateuch itself. This survey is divided into four parts: the first examines the general issue of ethical versus ritual law; the second investigates interruptions to the observance of the sacred times; the third explores the role of the sacred times in the eschatology of the Prophets; and the fourth discusses other Old Testament passages that may contain indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

#### Ethical versus Ritual Law

A number of Old Testament passages express the priority of ethical over ritual law in a limited fashion, but not in the general way that might be imagined. Some passages are concerned with the hypocrisy of multiplying sacrificial offerings, but simultaneously ignoring the law's basic ethical demands. However, in these cases it is

usually voluntary rather than mandatory offerings that are in view.<sup>1</sup> The focus of these passages is thus on the obvious but specific priority of what the law positively commands over what it merely permits and encourages.<sup>2</sup> Ps 50 has also been interpreted in terms of the contrast between spiritual and ceremonial worship.<sup>3</sup> However, the contrast here is between sacrifices offered for the purpose of manipulating the Deity and thanksgiving offerings brought out of gratitude for what he has already done.<sup>4</sup> In Mal 1:10, Yahweh is pictured as wishing that one of the priests would shut the temple door, so that they would not light the altar fires or bring any more grain-offering

---

<sup>1</sup>Ethical attributes are preferred to "sacrifice" (זבח) and "burnt offering" (עולה) in 1 Sam 15:22; Ps 51:16-19 (vss. 17-20, Hebrew); Jer 6:19, 20; 7:21-23; Hos 6:6. However, whenever these two terms are used together, voluntary rather than mandatory offerings are in view. See Milgrom, "Repudiation of Sacrifice," 273-275. Ethical attributes, likewise clearly preferred to strictly voluntary sacrifices, are also in view in Ps 69:30, 31 (vss. 31, 32, Hebrew); Prov 15:8; 21:3; Eccl 5:1 (4:17, Hebrew); Jer 11:14, 15; Mic 6:6-8.

<sup>2</sup>The same priority is evident in the distinctive stress on ethical purity in "entrance liturgies," such as Pss 15; 26. "There are Near Eastern parallels to such entrance liturgies, but in them the requirements for admission include ritual as well as moral qualities." Peter C. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, WBC, vol. 19 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 150.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., see John Calvin, Commentary on the Book of Psalms, vol. 2, trans. James Anderson (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949), 257-281.

<sup>4</sup>See Leslie C. Allen, "Structure and Meaning in Psalm 50," VE 14 (1984): 23.

(מנחה). Voluntary offerings are partly in view (vs. 14), but clearly this is a call for the whole priestly cultus to be suspended. However, in this context there is not even punctiliousness in correctly performing the sacrificial rituals (vss. 8, 12-14). Accordingly, the concern is with a selfish lack of proper attention to ritual detail, rather than with the priority of ethical law over ritual law per se. On the other hand, there are five passages that still warrant special attention: Pss 40:6-8 (vss. 7-9, Hebrew); 110; Isa 66:1-3; Jer 31:31-34; Dan 9:27.

Ps 40:6-8 (Vss. 7-9, Hebrew)

Ps 40 is a royal song of thanksgiving for past deliverance (vss. 1-10 [vss. 2-11, Hebrew]) and also an anticipation of deliverance from present affliction [vss. 11-17 (vss. 12-18, Hebrew)]. Thanksgiving in the Psalms is typically expressed through the offering of a sacrifice,<sup>1</sup> or through the fulfillment of one's vows.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the bold declaration of Ps 40:6-8 (vss. 7-9, Hebrew) comes as a surprise:

זבח ומנחה לאדחפצת אונים כרית לי עולה וחטאת לא שאלת:  
 או אקרחי הנדבאתי במגלת־ספר כתוב עלי:  
 לעשות־דצונך אלהי הפצתי וחורתיך בתוך מעי

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Pss 27:6; 50:14; 54:6 (vs. 8, Hebrew); 107:22; 116:17. See Wigram, 378.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Pss 22:25 (vs. 26, Hebrew); 50:14; 56:12 (vs. 13, Hebrew); 61:5, 8 (vss. 6, 9, Hebrew); 65:1 (vs. 2, Hebrew); 66:13; 116:14, 18. See Wigram, 797.

- 6 Sacrifice and grain-offering you do not desire,  
     Ears have you dug for me,<sup>1</sup>  
     Burnt offerings and sin offering you do not ask  
     for.
- 7 So I said,  
     "Look, I have come!,<sup>2</sup>  
     In a scroll of the book it [is] written about  
     me,
- 8 I desire to do your pleasure, my God,  
     And your law [is] within me."

The four terms for sacrifice used in Ps 40:6-8 cover all the main types of offering prescribed for the Levitical service, not just voluntary offerings.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, this statement illustrates the priority of ethical law over ritual law in general.

Kaiser argues that a number of words in Ps 40 "signaled that more was underfoot in this public praise than a testimony to God for a rather private and personal escape. Instead it had communal, indeed, worldwide implications; it was another link in God's promise plan."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Alexandrinus, along with Heb 10:5, instead have σῶμα δὲ κατηρίσω μοι ("and a body you have prepared for me"). Whatever the exact origin of this reading, it clearly "carries forward the sense of dedication implied in the Hebrew text." Derek Kidner, Psalms 1-72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms, TOTC (Leicester: Tyndale Press, 1973; 2d American printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), 159.

<sup>2</sup>On the reason for reading "Lo, I have come" as the content of the scroll of the book, see Kidner, 160, quoted below, pp. 247, 247.

<sup>3</sup>See F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964), 233.

<sup>4</sup>Kaiser, Uses of the Old Testament, 132.

In other words, this Psalm is ultimately messianic.<sup>1</sup> In a messianic context, it is of interest to note that Ps 40:6-8 not only affirms that obedience is better than sacrifice. It also pictures the king as providing the answer to the inadequacies of the sanctuary cultus by presenting himself as the ultimate sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> First, in vs. 7 (vs. 8, Hebrew) the king declares that he has specifically come because of the inadequacy of the sacrifices described in the previous verse.<sup>3</sup> Second, the break after the expression *הִנֵּנִי בָּא* ("Behold I have come") places the focus on the king himself more than upon his obedience per se. Third,

*the roll of the book could be a reference to a coronation decree (see on 2:7; cf. the end of 2 Ki. 22:13). But written of me refers more naturally to "Lo, I come", and therefore, it seems, to the conviction that his very coming is a fulfilment.*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., The Messiah in the Old Testament, Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, Harper Collins Pubs., 1995), 126. See also Gerard Van Groningen, Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990), 358.

<sup>2</sup>For this idea and the first two of my following three supporting arguments I am indebted to a personal conversation with Jacques Doukhan. Van Groningen, 360, notes an implicit reference to the self-sacrifice of the king in Ps 40:6-8, but not in the dimensions noted by Doukhan.

<sup>3</sup>Doukhan notes that the adverb *כֵּן* is better translated consequentially ("so") than temporally ("then"). See BDB, 23.

<sup>4</sup>Kidner, 160.

Accordingly,

after such a deliverance, what offering can one bring but one's heart and will? Such is the logic of this situation; yet David outruns it by speaking as if his self-offering will be the sacrifice to end all sacrifice. If this is the implication of his words, he is speaking not for himself but for the Messiah.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, Ps 40:6-8 gives general priority to ethical law over the whole sacrificial cultus and points to a messianic king who will fulfill the written word by presenting himself as the sacrifice to surpass all other sacrifices.

Ps 110:1, 4

Hans K. LaRondelle claims that "the abolishing of the whole Levitical priesthood and sacrificial service

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 159. Heb 10:5-10 would thus be correct in its use of Ps 40:6-8 as an indicator of the temporary nature of the Levitical sacrificial system. Ibid.

In personal conversation Doukhan argues that the clause "ears have you dug for me" in Ps 40:6 alludes to the ceremony of bonding a slave to his master forever described in Exod 21:6. He connects the messianic slave of Ps 40 with the suffering servant or slave of Isa 53:10, who offers himself as a guilt offering (~~DOU~~). Kidner, 159, rejects the link to Exod 21:6, arguing that the clause is more likely to be "a forceful parallel to the expressions used in Isaiah 50:4f.: 'he wakens my ear', 'the Lord God has opened my ear'; speaking of the Servant's training in perception and obedience." Thus, while Kidner interprets the digging out of the ears differently from Doukhan, he finds an even more direct link than Doukhan between it and the servant songs of Isaiah. However, he does not mention the link Doukhan sees with the servant's act of self-sacrifice in Isa 53:10.

. . . [is] announced in Ps 110:1, 4,"<sup>1</sup> the verses that respectively contain the two promises with which the two oracles of the Psalm begin:<sup>2</sup>

לדוד מזמור  
נאם יהוה לאדני שב לימיני  
עראשית איבך חרם לרגליך:  
נשבע יהוה ולא ינחם  
אחם כהן לעולם על דברתי מלכי צדק

- 1 By David,<sup>3</sup> a song.  
The utterance of Yahweh to my Lord:  
Sit at my right hand,  
Until I set your enemies  
As a stool for your feet.<sup>4</sup>
- 4 Yahweh has sworn,  
And he will not relent,  
"You [are] a priest in perpetuity  
After the order of Melchizedek."

---

<sup>1</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation, AUM, Studies in Religion, vol. 13 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 176, 177.

<sup>2</sup>On the structure of Ps 110, see Willem A. VanGemeren, "Psalms," EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs., 1991), 5:697.

<sup>3</sup>The phrase לדוד "cannot mean that the psalm was directed to David, because David was not a priest." M. J. Paul, "The Order of Melchizedek (Ps 110:4 and Heb 7:3)," WTJ 49 (1987): 202. Accordingly, the ל here has been read as a lamed auctoris. See Waltke and O'Connor, 206, 207. For evidence in support of Paul's claim that "David was not a priest," see below, p. 251, 252.

<sup>4</sup>Some manuscripts instead read הרם רגליך (literally, "a footstool") or הרם לרגליך (literally, "a stool for your foot").



LaRondelle's position seems to rest on two assumptions about Ps 110: first, on the assumption that it describes the enthronement of a priest-king,<sup>1</sup> and second, on the assumption that it envisages a new order of priesthood marred by none of the deficiencies of the Levitical priesthood.<sup>2</sup>

As for the first assumption, it has been argued that in Ps 110:1-3, "the King (i.e. David) is addressed by Zadok, while in verse 4 the latter is spoken to by the King, who confirms Zadok in the priesthood."<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, "there is not the slightest indication of this change of speaker. And the solemn declaration with *nē'ūm* in v 1 is more fitting to a prophet than to a priest."<sup>4</sup> In addition, "it would be highly unlikely to posit Zadok here as the recipient of the promise, because the promised

---

<sup>1</sup>See George B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," Canadian Journal of Theology 5 (1959): 47, 48.

<sup>2</sup>"The psalm was written at a time when the temple cultus was in the hands of the Levitical priests. Why should anyone dream of a new order of priesthood unless he felt the present order to be deficient?" Ibid., 48.

<sup>3</sup>A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms, vol. 2, Psalms (73-150), softback ed., NCBC (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Pub., 1972; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1992; London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Pub., 1992), 770.

<sup>4</sup>M. J. Paul, 200.

victory (vv. 5-7) speaks of the king's special relationship to the Lord."<sup>1</sup>

As for the second assumption, it has been claimed that Ps 110 does not envisage a new order of priesthood, because Israel's kingship was sacerdotal from the earliest times:

From the priestly laws it appears that there is a clear distinction between Israel's three theocratic officers: king, prophet, and priest. However, David was dressed as a priest (2 Sam 6:14), was in charge of the sacrifices (2 Sam 6:17-18), and gave a priestly blessing to the people (2 Sam 6:18). This was also true of Solomon (1 Kings 8:14, 55, 62-64), as his authority extended over the high priest (1 Kings 2:27, 35).<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand,

the sacrifices mentioned . . . are restricted to the burnt offerings and the peace offerings. Such sacrifices had to be made on the bronze altar of burnt offerings in the court of the tabernacle or temple and could be made by any Israelite. . . . Yet there is no evidence that a king ever entered the holy place of the temple to burn incense on the altar of incense. . . . With regard to the linen ephod, one has to be cautious with the qualification "a priestly dress," because little Samuel, who was a Levite though not a priest, wore an ephod too. It is likely that David put on the ephod as a sign of devotion to the Lord. . . . But David did not act as a priest.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>VanGemeren, 699.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 699.

<sup>3</sup>M. J. Paul, 197.

In addition, "it cannot be maintained that only priests were allowed to bless, so that consequently giving a blessing was a priestly function of the king."<sup>1</sup>

It has been argued that Ps 110 does not envisage any transfer of priesthood to a king, but instead is an attempt to legitimize the transfer of the kingship from the Davidic line to the Levitical Maccabees.<sup>2</sup> However, while

we know that some Maccabean priests wanted to rule as kings, . . . this is no legitimate development in the light of the OT. It is improbable that the author or redactor of Psalm 110 would stimulate this new evolution. A poet in the time of the Maccabees (who were of the family of Aaron) would not attribute to the king a priesthood like that of Melchizedek.<sup>3</sup>

In Wellhausen's reconstruction of history, the kingly priesthood is important in the early monarchy, and the so-called "Priestly Code" is seen as progressively increasing the rights of the Levitical priesthood at the king's expense.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, if Ps 110 were dated to

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 201, citing Deut 27:12; 33:1-29; Josh 14:13; 22:15. The Massoretic text of 2 Sam 8:18 speaks of David's sons as כהנים or priests. However, in view of the evidence of the versions, a good case exists that כהנים is a misreading of סכנים ("administrators"). See G. J. Wenham, "Were David's Sons Priests?" ZAW 87 (1975): 80-82.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Bernhard Duhm, Die Psalmen, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, vol. 14 (Freiburg I. B.: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899), 254-256.

<sup>3</sup>M. J. Paul, 199.

<sup>4</sup>Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, Scholars Press Reprints and Translations Series (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1885; reprinted with new prefatory matter, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994), 147, 150.

David's day, it could not have the abolition of the Levitical priesthood in view, simply because the Levitical priesthood is alleged to have been of no special prominence at the time. Indeed, the historical trend of the Old Testament would have to be towards the abolition of the kingly priesthood and the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, rather than vice versa. However,

it is very remarkable that, in the temple mentioned by Ezekiel, the king . . . has not only some rights, but also some duties with regard to the cult (44:3; 45:16-17, 22-25; 46:2-8). Therefore certain evidence appears to contradict the view that, during the Exile period, there was strong opposition against the king, in order to reduce his rights. David, who organized the Levitical service, is glorified especially in Chronicles. Thus, the books which are labelled most "priestly" by Wellhausen put the davidic house in the center of their interest.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, Ps 110:1, 4 describes the enthronement of a priest-king in a new order of priesthood superseding the existing Levitical system. Accordingly, a good case exists that it does indeed announce "the abolishing of the whole Levitical priesthood and sacrificial service."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>M. J. Paul, 198.

<sup>2</sup>LaRondelle, 176, 177. Heb 7 is thus correct in its use of Ps 110:4 as an indicator of the temporary nature of the Levitical priesthood. See M. J. Paul, 210; Caird, 47, 48. The future union of priestly and kingly roles in a single figure is also anticipated in other Old Testament passages, such as Zech 6:9-15. See Joyce G. Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972), 132-128; idem, "Short Notes: SEMAH as a Technical Term in the Prophets," VT 14 (1964): 95-97; Kaiser, Messiah, 214, 215. On Jer 33:14-26, see below, p. 369, n. 4.

Isa 66:1-3

The divine poetic speech of Isa 66:1-17 sharply contrasts the fate of the righteous and the wicked. This speech is introduced in vss. 1-3:

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה  
הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּסְאִי וְהָאָרֶץ הָרֶגְלִי  
אֵיזָה בֵּית אֲשֶׁר תִּבְנֶנּוּ וְאֵיזָה מְקוֹם מְנוּחָתִי:  
וְאֵת-כָּל-אֱלֹהֵי יָדִי עֲשֵׂתָה וְיִהְיוּ כָל-אֱלֹהֵי נְאֻמֵּיהוּ  
וְאֵלֶּזְה אֲבִישׁ אֶל-עֵנִי וְנִכְהַדְרוּ וְחָרַד עַל-דְּבָרִי:  
שׁוֹחֵט הַשּׁוֹר מִכֶּה-אִישׁ זֹבֵחַ הַשֶּׁה עֶרְף כָּלֵב  
מַעֲלֵה מִנְחָה דֶם חֲזִיר מִזְכִּיר לִבְנֵה מְבָרֵךְ אוֹן  
נִסְדָּמָה בַּחֲרוֹ בִּדְרִכֵּיהֶם וּבְשִׁקְצֵיהֶם נִפְשָׁם חֲפָצָה

- 1 Thus has said Yahweh,  
 "The heavens [are] my throne,  
 and the earth [is] my footstool.  
 Where [is] this house that you could build me,<sup>1</sup>  
 or where [is] this my resting-place?"
- 2 "But all these things my hand has made,  
 and all these things are,"<sup>2</sup>  
 [is] the utterance of Yahweh.  
 "But to this one I look: to [one who is] humble  
 and stricken of spirit, and trembles at my  
 word."
- 3 One who slaughters the ox kills a man,  
 One who sacrifices the sheep breaks a dog's  
 neck.  
 One who offers up a grain-offering [offers up]  
 swine's blood,  
 One who offers incense as a memorial blesses  
 wickedness.

---

<sup>1</sup>Since Isa 66:1, 2 underscores the limitation of any earthly temple man might build, the imperfect verb **תִּבְנֶנּוּ** is better read as a nonperfective of capability ("Where is the house you could build for me?") than as a future non-perfective ("Where is the house you will build for me?"). See Waltke and O'Connor, 507.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX reading, **καὶ ἔσονται ἐμὰ** ("and they are mine"), followed by the Targum and the Syriac, is probably based on reading the Hebrew as **וְלִי הֵיוּ** rather than **וְיִהְיוּ** ("and they are").

Also they have chosen their ways,  
And in their abominations their soul takes  
delight.

It has been argued that in Isa 66:3, "a series of legitimate sacrifices, as far as the Torah is concerned, is . . . identified with some that are prohibited."<sup>1</sup> This verse has thus been interpreted as "a claim that the ancient sacrifices are no longer valid in the new age,"<sup>2</sup> despite references to sacrificial offerings in Isa 56:7; 60:7.<sup>3</sup> However, this interpretation fails for three reasons.

First, Isa 66:3 does not actually place legal and illegal sacrifices on the same level. Instead, it identifies those who offer the legitimate sacrifices as those who also offer illegitimate sacrifices. It is true that "the ancient versions all supply a particle of likeness—he that slays an ox is like one that murders a man, & c."<sup>4</sup> However, in so doing they seem to have blunted the impact of the verse, for in view of vs. 17, there is no

---

<sup>1</sup>John D. W. Watts, Isaiah 34-66, WBC, vol. 25 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 355.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 356.

<sup>3</sup>As noted by F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, vol. 2, trans. James Martin (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949), 494.

<sup>4</sup>J. A. Alexander, Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, rev. and ed. John Eadie, 2 vols. complete and unabridged in 1, Zondervan Classic Commentaries (n.p., 1865; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1953), 461.

reason why syncretistic practice should not be in view in vs. 3.

Second, even if Isa 66:3 did place legal and illegal sacrifices on the same level, it could simply be because of the hypocrisy of those participating in the legitimate cult, and not because of any fault in the cult itself.

Third, Isa 66:3 does not claim to be describing those living in the new age. Instead, it describes those who are to be judged before the new age dawns, and the writer would presumably want some of his contemporaries to see a picture of themselves and their present sins in his description.

Clearly, Isa 66:3 does not address the issue of the future of the cultus. However, Isa 66:1, 2, does emphasize that a temple built on earth can only ever be a limited representation of divine reality,<sup>1</sup> and so implies the temporary nature of some of the details of the sanctuary cultus.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See also 1 Kgs 8:27; Delitzsch, 2:495.

<sup>2</sup>Just as Exod 25:9, 40 does. See above, pp, 70-76. There thus appears to be merit in the way that Acts 7:48-50 uses Isa 66:1, 2 to relativize the temporal significance of the temple.

Jer 31:31-34

Jer 31:31-34 is in the first part of "The Book of Consolation" and is the only Old Testament passage to use the actual term "a new covenant" (ברית חדשה):<sup>1</sup>

הנה ימים באים נאמיהוה וכרתי את־בית ישראל ואת־בית יהודה ברית חדשה  
לא כברית אשר כרתי את־אבותם ביום החזיקי בידם להוציאם מארץ מצרים  
אשר־המה הפרו את־בריתי ואנכי בעלתי בם נאמיהוה: כי זאת הברית אשר  
אכרת את־בית ישראל אחרי הימים ההם נאמיהוה נתתי את־תורת־י בקרבם ועל־  
לבם אכתובנה והייתי להם לאלהים והמה יהיו־לי לעם: ולא ילמדו עוד איש  
את־דעהו ואיש את־אחיו לאמר רעו את־יהוה כי־כולם ידעו אותי למקטנם  
ועד־גדולם נאמיהוה כי אסלח לעונם ולחטאתם לא אוכר־עור

- 31 "Behold, days are coming," [is] the utterance of Yahweh, "that I will cut a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."  
32 "[It will] not [be] like the covenant that I cut with their fathers on the day I lay hold of their hand and brought them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, and I had been a husband to them," [is] the utterance of Yahweh.  
33 "For this is the covenant that I will cut with the House of Israel<sup>2</sup> after those days," [is] the utterance of Yahweh. "I will surely put<sup>3</sup> my law inside them and upon their heart will I write it, and I will be their God, they will be people to me."

---

<sup>1</sup>Thompson, Jeremiah, 579. "The Book of Consolation" in Jer 30-33 may be divided into two parts, the first depicting the restoration of Israel and Judah (Jer 31-32) and the second depicting the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem (Jer 33-34). See *ibid.*, 128.

<sup>2</sup>Some manuscripts read בני ישראל ("the Children of Israel") instead of בית ישראל ("the House of Israel").

<sup>3</sup>The verb נתתי is here translated as a prophetic perfect. E.g., see Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 312, 313; Waltke and O'Connor, 489, 490; Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2d ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 30. However, many manuscripts simply have the perfect consecutive ונתתי ("And I will put").



- 34 "No-one will any longer teach his neighbor or his brother, saying, 'Know Yahweh,' for all of them will know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them," [is] the utterance of Yahweh, "for I will forgive their iniquities, and their sins I will remember no more."

It has been claimed that external laws and rules have no place in this new covenant.<sup>1</sup> However, as

McComiskey notes:

Jeremiah . . . affirmed the perpetuity of the law. He stated that the law (*tôrāh*) will be placed within the hearts of the people. Although it is possible that the prophet used the word *tôrāh* in the more general sense of the will of God, without reference to the Mosaic law, it is highly unlikely. He spoke not of a change in the nature of *tôrāh*, but of its localization. The covenant context of the passage would certainly lead Jeremiah's hearers to think in terms of the Mosaic legislation, and Jeremiah used the term *tôrāh* to refer to the statutes of the Mosaic covenant in every one of its occurrences in his prophecy.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, a strong argument exists that each item in Jer 31:31-34 "is but a repetition of some familiar aspect of salvation already known in the Old Testament."<sup>3</sup> For example, the theme of the law in the heart is found in Deut 6:6, 7 and Ps 37:31; the hope that God should be Israel's God and that they should be his people is an allusion to

---

<sup>1</sup>Feinberg, 576.

<sup>2</sup>McComiskey, 84, 85. See Jer 2;8; 6:19; 8:8; 9:13 (vs. 12, Hebrew); 16:11; 18:18; 26:4; 32:33; 44:10, 23, as listed by Wigram, 1344. Compare the comment on Jer 31:33 made by Lohfink, Covenant, 94, 95: "According to this text, the torah was the same in the former, broken covenant as it is to be in the covenant that is to result anew from God's pardon."

<sup>3</sup>Wilber B. Wallis, "Irony in Jeremiah's Prophecy of a New Covenant," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society 12 (1969): 107.

the fundamental promise of Gen 17:7; and the forgiveness of sin is a prominent feature of passages such as Excd 34:6, 7; Ps 103:8-12.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, it has been suggested that the description of the covenant as "new" is a clever piece of irony:

A new covenant was promised, but a new covenant whose features were only the simplicities of spiritual religion reiterated since Abraham. . . . For a complacent person to hear that the law was to be known in the heart, that he should know the Lord, that sin could be forgiven, that Yahweh was his God and Israel his people—all this could leave the undiscerning and complacent in the same condition. . . . But for a man to be told, albeit with subtlety and indirection, that the basic matters of spiritual religion were foreign to him—this would tend to destroy complacency and bring conviction.<sup>2</sup>

In this case, the continued validity of the law under the new covenant would be expected, for the new covenant is simply the realization of God's previous covenant promises.

The other side of the issue is that "details in the shape of the torah may change."<sup>3</sup> In this respect, it

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 108. Wallis argues that the same irony is at work in the New Testament references to the new covenant (Gal 4:21-31; 2 Cor 3:14, 15; Heb 8:8). Ibid., 109, 110. Note his reiteration of this position in idem, review of Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? by D. P. Fuller, in Covenant Seminary Review 8 (1982): 76, 77, and the support given to his interpretation by Frederick Holmgren, "A New Covenant? For Whom?" Covenant Quarterly 43 (1985): 39-44.

<sup>3</sup>Lohfink, Covenant, 95. See above, p. 99, on the difference between Lev 17:3-7 and Deut 12:5, and above, p. 49, n. 3, on Gen 26:5. See also above, pp. 78-80, on Lohfink's understanding of internal indicators that certain parts of the Pentateuchal law are of limited applicability in time and space.

should be noted that from the first century until now Christians have often interpreted the promise of sins being forgiven and forgotten in Jer 31:34 as an internal indicator of the transient nature of the Old Testament's sacrifices for sin.<sup>1</sup> However, in the Old Testament divine forgiveness is repeatedly offered or sought for in the present, without any hint of a correlating suspension of sin offerings.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, in Leviticus and Numbers, it is through the sacrificial system that this forgiveness is effected.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, it is in the present that Yahweh remembers sins no more.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, nothing in the language of Jer 31:34 itself necessitates the abolition of the sacrificial system. On the other hand, it is here argued that Jer 31:31-34 points to the ultimate realization

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, Jer 31:33, 34, is quoted in Heb 10:16, 17, then vs. 18 comments, **ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκέτι προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας** ("where there is forgiveness of these things, [there is] no more offering for sins"). Caird argues that "here is a perfectly sound piece of exegesis. . . . The sacrifices of the old covenant were a perpetual reminder of sin and of man's need for atonement, but what men needed was the effective removal of sin, so that it could no longer barricade the way into the inner presence of God." Caird, 47.

<sup>2</sup>Accordingly, notice the use of the verb **נָסַח** in Exod 34:9; Num 14:19, 20; 1 Kgs 8:30, 34, 36, 39, 50; 2 Kgs 5:18; 2 Chr 6:21, 25, 27, 30, 39; Pss 25:11; 103:3; Isa 55:7; Dan 9:9; and Amos 7:2, as listed by Wigram, 877.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7 (5:26, Hebrew); 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28, as listed by Wigram, 887.

<sup>4</sup>Ps 25:7; Isa 43:25; 64:9 (vs. 8, Hebrew); Ezek 33:16; as listed by Wigram, 386, 387.

of the covenant promises. Furthermore, in terms of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch itself, the final realization of the purpose of the covenant would involve just such an abolition.<sup>1</sup> There may thus ultimately be an Old Testament theological basis for seeing a temporal limit on the applicability of the sacrificial system in Jer 31:34.

In conclusion, Jer 31:31-34 affirms the essential perpetuity of the law under the new covenant, even as it hints at the temporary nature of the system of sacrifices for sin.

#### Dan 9:27a

The prediction in Dan 9:27a comes towards the end of the prophecy of the seventy weeks in Dan 9:24-27:

והנביר ברית לרבים שבוע אחד  
וחצי השבוע ישבית זבח ומנחה

And he will make strong a covenant with many  
For one week.  
And for half the week,  
He will cause sacrifice and grain-offering to  
stop.<sup>2</sup>

J. A. Montgomery has stated that "the history of the exegesis of the 70 weeks is the Dismal Swamp of OT

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 73-75.

<sup>2</sup>Symmachus has *παύσεται* ("it will cease"), probably on the basis of reading the Qal *ישבית* instead of the Hiphil *ישבית*.

criticism,"<sup>1</sup> and it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to examine the intricate history of the interpretation of Dan 9:24-27. However, a strong case has recently been made in favor of the traditional historical-messianic interpretation of the seventy weeks,<sup>2</sup> and it is accordingly the interpretation adopted here.

In the historical-messianic interpretation, it is the Messiah who both confirms a covenant and brings an end to the sacrificial system.<sup>3</sup> In view of the prayer of Dan 9, the covenant confirmed in vs. 27 is probably the Sinai covenant.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, Dan 9:27 would predict that the

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Montgomery, A Commentary on Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), 400.

<sup>2</sup>Brempong Owusu-Antwi, The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Pub., 1995). See also Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, DARCOM, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 3-63; William H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 75-118.

<sup>3</sup>Owusu-Antwi, 198, 312-316; Shea, "Daniel 9:24-27," 95, 96.

<sup>4</sup>Compare Dan 9:11, 13 with Exod 19:5 and Deut 4:13. For more information, see Owusu-Antwi, 182; Shea, "Daniel 9:24-27," 95. Shea claims that the covenant of Dan 9:27 "does not appear to be the new covenant . . . even though it also went into effect in this period." Ibid. However, this statement overstates the contrast between the Sinaitic and new covenants. See above, p. 258. Owusu-Antwi, 186, sums up the matter better when he argues that "with the Sinaitic covenant confirmed for Daniel's people, the 'new covenant' would have been to them a renewal of the old with

Messiah will affirm the essence of the law at the same time as he abrogates the sacrificial system.<sup>1</sup>

Interruptions to the Observance of  
the Pentateuchal Sacred Times

There are a number of Old Testament passages where divinely permitted interruptions to the observance of one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times are implied. These passages are included in this study because of the light many of them cast on the issue of ethical law versus ritual law, as well as the relevance of some of them to the criteria used in this dissertation to determine whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary.

The Passover in Josh 5:1-10

Josh 5:1-10 contains a limitation on Passover observance in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.

Josh 5:1 describes the fear of the kings of the Amorites and Canaanites after they had heard how Yahweh had brought the Israelites across the Jordan. Vs. 2 reports

---

new privileges."

<sup>1</sup>Compare how Doukhan, Sources, 82, argues from the New Testament that the crucifixion has rendered the Levitical cult unnecessary, then asks, "Had not the prophet Daniel predicted this development? The death of the Messiah would cause sacrifices and offerings to cease. See Daniel 9:27."

the divine command for the people to be circumcised, and vs. 3 reports Joshua's compliance with this command. Vss. 4-7 give an extended explanation of this command:

וזה הדבר אשר-מל יהושע כל-העם היצא ממצרים הזכרים כל אנשי המלחמה  
מתו במדבר בדרך בצאתם ממצרים: כי-מלים היו כל-העם היצאים וכל-העם  
הילדים במדבר בדרך בצאתם ממצרים לא-מלו: כי ארבעים שנה הלכו בני-  
ישראל במדבר עד-הם כל-הנני אנשי המלחמה היצאים ממצרים אשר לא-  
שמעו בקול יהוה אשר נשבע יהוה להם לבלתי הראותם את-הארץ אשר נשבע  
יהוה לאבותם לתת לנו ארץ זבת חלב ודבש: ואחד-בניהם הקים תחתם אתם מל  
יהושע כי-ערלים היו כי לא-מלו אותם בדרך

- 4 And this [is] the reason why Joshua circumcised [them]: all the people who had come out of Egypt—[that is,] the males [or] all the warriors<sup>1</sup>—had died in the wilderness on the way after they had come out from Egypt.
- 5 For all the people who had come out were circumcised, but they did not circumcise all the people who had been born in the wilderness after they had come out of Egypt,
- 6 because for forty years<sup>2</sup> the Children of Israel wandered in the wilderness until the death<sup>3</sup> of the entire nation<sup>4</sup> of the warriors who had come out of Egypt who had not listened to the voice of Yahweh, whom Yahweh swore would not see the land that

---

<sup>1</sup>The phrase אנשי מלחמה literally means "men of war."

<sup>2</sup>Some LXX manuscripts refer to forty-two years instead of forty years, presumably on the basis of the assumption that the forty years of Num 14:33, 34 begin with the rebellion at Kadesh-Barnea, rather than with the Israelites' departure from Egypt.

<sup>3</sup>The word חם literally means "completeness." See Koehler and Baumgartner, 1030.

<sup>4</sup>A few Massoretic manuscripts have כל-הדור ("the entire generation") instead of כל-הנני ("the entire nation").

Yahweh had sworn to their fathers to give us:<sup>1</sup> a land flowing with milk and honey.

- 7 He raised up their sons<sup>2</sup> in their place, and Joshua circumcised them, for they were uncircumcised, because they had not circumcised them on the way.

The suspension of the practice of circumcision in the wilderness is not related to the difficulties of wandering in the wilderness, because the internal chronology of the Pentateuch makes provision for very long periods of rest when circumcision would have presented no danger.<sup>3</sup> Instead, a comparison of Josh 5:6 and Num 14:29-34 suggests that it is related to the suspension of the covenant after the rebellion at Kadesh-Barnea.<sup>4</sup> Since

---

<sup>1</sup>Some manuscripts, followed by the Syriac, maintain the third person reference to the Israelites by reading לָהֶם ("to them") rather than לָנוּ ("to us").

<sup>2</sup>The Targum, Syriac, and Vulgate evidently read וְאֶחָד־בְּנֵיהֶם הִקְמִים ("And their sons who arise") rather than וְאֶחָד־בְּנֵיהֶם הִקְמִים ("And he raised up their sons").

<sup>3</sup>E.g., see W. G. Blaikie, The Book of Joshua, EB, vol. 6 (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), 112.

<sup>4</sup>"The older generation left Egypt as an עַם, a people of God (v 4), indeed a circumcised עַם (v 5a). It died, however, as a גֵּוִי, a nation of God's enemies (v 6 . . .). The younger generation was born an עַם in the wilderness (v 5b). It became a גֵּוִי (v 8) until it was circumcised. . . . Turning from a nation to a people is the goal of Israel for the Deuteronomist (Deut 4:6). But Israel sought to be like the גֵּוִי." Trent C. Butler, Joshua, WBC, vol. 7 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 59. Admittedly, in this interpretation the ban against circumcision would not have applied to the two years in the wilderness before the rebellion at Kadesh-Barnea, whereas Josh 5:5 states that "they did not circumcise all the people who had been born in the wilderness after they had come out of Egypt." However,



participation in the Passover feast is elsewhere restricted to those who are circumcised,<sup>1</sup> its suspension might also be expected to accompany that of the covenant after the Kadesh-Barnea rebellion. Josh 5:10 implicitly confirms this expectation:

וַיֵּחַן בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּגִלְגָּל וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֶת־הַפֶּסַח בָּאָרְבָּעָה עָשָׂה יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ בְּעָרְבוֹת יְרִיחוֹ

And the Children of Israel camped in Gilgal,<sup>2</sup> and they observed the Passover<sup>3</sup> on the fourteenth day of the month in the evening in the desert regions of Jericho.

Accordingly, Josh 5:1-10 suggests that both circumcision and the Passover do not belong to the realm of universal morality, but are part of Yahweh's distinctive covenant with Israel.

---

that the word "all" (כָּל) does not have an absolute sense in Josh 5:1-10 is clear from an analysis of its use in vss. 4, 5. As noted Keil and Delitzsch: "In vers. 4 and 5 the Israelites are divided into two classes: (1) All the people that came out of Egypt and were circumcised; and (2) All the people that were born in the desert and were uncircumcised. The first of these died in the wilderness, the second came to Canaan and were circumcised by Joshua at Gilgal. But if we should press the word 'all' in these clauses, it would follow that all the male children who were under twenty years of age at the time of the Exodus, either died in the desert or were circumcised a second time at Gilgal." C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, trans. James Martin, BCOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1960), 55, n. 1.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., in Exod 12:43-49. See above, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup>In a case of haplography, some LXX manuscripts omit any translation of this opening clause of Josh 5:10.

<sup>3</sup>Many Massoretic manuscripts, followed by the Syriac, assimilate to the instructions for dating the Passover elsewhere in the Old Testament by adding the phrase בְּרִאשׁוֹן ("in the first month").

### The Day of Atonement in the Historical Writings

In the historical writings, four passages clearly refer to cultic events in the seventh month: 1 Kgs 8:65, 66; 2 Chr 7:9; Ezra 3:1-6; and Neh 8. Elsewhere, the Day of Atonement is dated to the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev 16:29; 23:27; Num 29:7). However, none of the four passages in the historical writings ever mentions it, although they do mention events before and after that date.<sup>1</sup> This subsection explores possible reasons for this silence in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

According to 1 Kgs 8:65, 66 and 2 Chr 7:9, the dedication of Solomon's temple is marked by a week-long celebration immediately preceding the Feast of Booths.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Neh 9:1 refers to the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month as a day of fasting, and it has been claimed that for some reason the observance of the Day of Atonement is here delayed until two weeks after the conclusion of the Feast of Booths. E.g., see W. Möller and J. B. Payne, "Atonement, Day of," ISBE, rev. ed. (1982), 1:360-362. However, "a reading of Neh 9:1-3 finds . . . that on this twenty-fourth day there were fasting, confession of sins, and reading of the law, but nothing is said about the sacrificial rituals required on the Day of Atonement." Hartley, 218.

<sup>2</sup>1 Kgs 8:65 speaks of two periods of seven days adding up to a total of fourteen days, and vs. 66 speaks of the celebrations finishing on the eighth day. It has thus been suggested that the references to an extra period of seven days and to a fourteen-day total are later additions adopted from the tradition of Chronicles. E.g., see Edward Lewis Curtis and Albert Alonzo Madsen, A Critical and

2 Chr 7:9, 10, confirms the Pentateuchal dating of the Feast of Booths from the fifteenth to the twenty-second days of the seventh month (Lev 23:33-36, 39-43; Num 29:12-38), and thus the extra week would begin on the eighth day of the month, two days before the date assigned for the Day of Atonement.

It has been claimed that the Day of Atonement must have been observed during the dedication of the temple, but that 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles are silent about it.<sup>1</sup> However, it is difficult to see how the Day of Atonement could be celebrated at the same time as a festival designated as a *mo'ed*, considering the emphasis on solemn fasting in the former and on eating in the latter.<sup>2</sup> Various explanations have thus been offered to explain why it would not have been observed at this time. It has been

---

Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910), 348. However, there is no contradiction between the verses if the expression "the eighth day" is simply read as a technical designation for the last day of the Feast of Booths, just as in Lev 23:39. The omission of any reference to the extra period of seven days and to a fourteen-day total in a few LXX manuscripts is probably a haplography.

<sup>1</sup>Raymond B. Dillard, 2 Chronicles, WBC, vol. 15 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 58.

<sup>2</sup>Commenting on Lev 16:31; 23:29, Levine, 109, notes that "in biblical literature the idiom *'innah nefesh* always connotes fasting, as Ibn Ezra observed and as we may deduce from the contexts of Isaiah 58:3, 10 and Psalms 35:13." In addition, this idiom may suggest abstinence from anointing the body (Dan 10:12) as well as sleeping on the ground, not changing one's clothes, and refraining from sex and bathing (2 Sam 12:16-20). See Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 1054.

argued that the Day of Atonement originates after the time of Solomon,<sup>1</sup> or that if it does exist earlier, no date is fixed for it by the time of his reign.<sup>2</sup> Gen. Rab. 35:3 claims that the observance of Day of Atonement is suspended because of the overriding importance of the temple dedication. However, the best explanation is that a temple that is still being dedicated is not yet in a state of defilement, and hence in no immediate need of cleansing. Accordingly, 1 Kgs 8:65, 66 and 2 Chr 7:9, 10 suggest that the observance of the Day of Atonement is dependent upon the operation of the sanctuary cultus.

Ezra 3:1-6 mentions the reinstitution of offerings at the site of the temple on the first day of the seventh month, and specifically speaks of the required sacrifices being offered for the Feast of Booths. Neh 8 mentions the special status of the first day of the seventh month, and a spectacular observance of the Feast of Booths unparalleled since the days of Joshua (vs. 17). However, neither passage raises the topic of the observance of the Day of Atonement.

The Day of Atonement is probably not mentioned in Neh 8 because the focus of the chapter is on the people as a whole, and not on the priests who bear the primary

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Jacob Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," Encyclopedia Judaica (1970), 5:1387.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see Hartley, 219.

responsibility for the day.<sup>1</sup> However, this explanation is hardly adequate for the omission of any reference to it in Ezra 3:1-6, where the function of the altar is especially in focus. The omission is best explained in terms of the intrinsic dependence of the Day of Atonement upon the operation of the tripartite sanctuary. As noted by Jacob Myers:

Morning and evening offerings could begin as soon as there was an altar; likewise the great festival of Sukkoth, one of the three national festivals, could be carried out at the proper time. There is obviously no mention of the atonement because the temple was not yet in existence.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, the omission of any reference to the Day of Atonement in Ezra 3:1-6 is readily understandable in terms of the particular focus of the chapter. However, the omission of any reference to it in 2 Kgs 8:65, 66; 2 Chr 7:9, 10; and Ezra 3:1-6 illustrates how the Day of

---

<sup>1</sup>Jacob Milgrom, "Atonement, Day of," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplement (1976), 82, 83. See also Yehezkel Kaufmann, History of the Religion of Israel, vol. 4, From the Babylonian Captivity to the End of Prophecy (New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1977; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1977; Dallas, TX: Institute for Jewish Studies, 1977), 390; Derek Kidner, Ezra and Nehemiah: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979), 108; Walter F. Adeney, Ezra and Nehemiah, Limited Classical Reprint Library (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1980), 278.

The emphasis on the responsibilities of the people rather than the priests may also explain the omission of any reference in Neh 8 to the blowing of trumpets on the first day of the seventh month. See Bloch, 15.

<sup>2</sup>Jacob M. Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB, vol. 14 (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965), 27.

Atonement in the Old Testament is intrinsically dependent upon the continued operation of the sanctuary.

Sabbath, New Moon, or Annual Sacred Times  
in the Eighth-Century Prophets

Amos 5:21-27

Amos 5:18-20 predicts that the Day of Yahweh will bring disaster to Israel. Vss. 21-24 explain the reason why:

שנאתי מאסתי חניכם ולא אריח בעצרתיהם:  
כיראמ העלולי עלות  
ומנחתיכם לא ארצה ושלם מריאיכם לא אביט:  
הסר מעלי המון שריך וזמרת נבליך לא אשמע:  
ויגל כמים משפט וצדקה כנחל איתן

- 21 I hate, I despise your feasts,  
And I do not enjoy the stench of your solemn assemblies.
- 22 For when you offer me burnt offerings  
And grain offerings, I am not pleased,  
And I do not look at the peace offering of  
your fatlings.
- 23 Take away from me the din of your songs,  
And the music of your harps I will not hear.
- 24 And let judgment roll down like the waters,  
And righteousness like the flowing stream.

With "unqualified vehemence," the prophet portrays Yahweh's abhorrence of Israel's "feasts" (חניכם) and "solemn assemblies" (עצרתיהם),<sup>1</sup> terms that particularly bring the three pilgrim feasts into focus.<sup>2</sup> However, the people's

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul, Amos, 189.

<sup>2</sup>"The substantive חן is the technical term originally employed as the name for the three pilgrimage festivals (see Exod 23:14-16; 34:22, 25)." Ibid. In addition, "עצרת" becomes the technical expression for the

voluntary offerings and music are rejected here, rather than the staple of the cult per se.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the

---

seventh day of Passover (Deut 16:8) and for the eighth day of Sukkoth (Lev 23:36). In Second Temple times the word was employed as a synonym for the holiday of 'Weeks,' Shavuoth, for example, Mishnah, Halah 4:10." Ibid., 189, n. 11. However, it has been argued that "when *hag* appears without further definition, it refers to the great fall pilgrimage festival," i.e., the Feast of Booths. John H. Hayes, Amos the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1988), 172. Hayes thus contends that the Feast of Booths is in view in Amos 5:21, and that the plural *hagim* is used either to denote "all their observances of fall festival, past and present," or to indicate that "the fall festival/pilgrimage and assembly were being held at two major royal sanctuaries simultaneously [i.e., at Dan and Bethel]." Ibid., 172, 173. However, his premise is flawed, for "perhaps the most common misconception concerning the autumn festival is the assertion made . . . that it was known as *hag*, 'The Festival.' . . . The passages most often cited in support of this argument are 1 Kgs 8:2, 65 and 2 Chr 5:3; 7:8, 9. . . . A closer examination of these texts, however, reveals that there is nothing to suggest a special designation of 'The Festival.' In every case in which *hag* appears with the article in reference to the autumn festival, the month or name of the festival has been previously identified in the same pericope. . . . In 1 Kgs 8:2 and 2 Chr 5:3, this clarification occurs adjacent to the word *hag*. In subsequent portions of these pericopes, it is clear that the same festival is still being discussed so that the use of the definite article suffices to specify the festival without having to repeat the entire name or designation. The very same technique is used in Ezek 45:23 to refer to the Passover." Scott, 46, 47.

<sup>1</sup>Amos "does not declare all forms of sacrifice unacceptable. Three different sacrifices are noted. These are the burnt offering (*olah*), the cereal offering (*minhah*), and the well-being offering (here called *shelem* rather than the normal *shelamim*). These sacrifices fell into the category of voluntary offerings. They were sacrifices brought at the initiative of the worshiper, except when they accompanied mandatory offerings. . . . Mandatory offerings, those required by God to remedy and restore the situation created by sinful offenses . . . , were the purgation offering (*hattat*) and reparation offering (*asham*). Amos does not mention, and therefore

preference expressed for continued judgment and righteousness only implies the priority of what the law commands over that which it merely permits and encourages.<sup>1</sup> In other words, Amos 5:21-24 simply condemns the hypocrisy of a scrupulous compliance with the voluntary aspects of the law at the expense of its mandatory dictates.

Amos 5:25-27 gives a supporting argument for Yahweh's rejection of the cult and pictures the ultimate judgment to come:

הוֹבָחִים וּמִנְחָה הַנִּשְׁתַּמְלִי בְּמִדְבַּר אַרְבַּעִים שָׁנָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל:  
וְנִשְׁאַחַם אֶחָד סִכּוֹת מַלְכֵכֶם וְאֵחָד כִּיּוֹן צִלְמֵיכֶם כִּיכֹב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם  
לָכֶם: וְהִנֵּלִיתִי אֶחֶכֶם מִהֶלָּא לְרִמְשֶׁק אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ

25 "Did you offer me sacrifices and grain-offering  
In the wilderness for forty years, O house of  
Israel?

---

certainly does not condemn, mandatory offerings in . . . 5:21-23." Hayes, 172.

<sup>1</sup>Keil claims that "the meaning of ver. 24 is not, 'Let justice and righteousness take the place of your sacrifices.' . . . The verse is to be explained according to Isa. x. 22, and threatens the flooding of the land with judgment and the punitive righteousness of God." C. F. Keil, The Twelve Minor Prophets, vol. 1, trans. James Martin, BCOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949), 289. However, if Amos 5:24 begins the judgment threat, its first verb should be in the perfect consecutive form rather than in the imperfect conjunctive jussive form. See Hans Walter Wolff, Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Prophets Joel and Amos, trans. Waldemar Janzen et al., Herm (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977), 264. In addition, "if v 24 begins the threat of judgment, then 'justice' and 'righteousness' would have to be interpreted as referring to acts of Yahweh, which is never the case with these words elsewhere in Amos (cf. 5:7, 6:12). Finally, in Is 1:13-17 there is a thematically comparable transition from the cultic sphere to the legal ('justice' [משפט] in Is 1:17)." Ibid.



- 26 "Or did you use to lift up<sup>1</sup> Sikkuth, your king,  
Or Kiyyun, your images, your star-god,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The expression סִכּוּת has often been translated by the future tense, as in "you shall lift up." See Paul, Amos, 188; Andersen and Freedman, 535. In this case, Amos 5:26, 27 would consist of a threat that Israel will carry her idols off into captivity. However, this idea "is utterly foreign to the prophetic range of thought. It is not those who go into captivity who carry their gods away with them; but the gods of a vanquished nation are carried away by the conquerors (Isa. xlv. 1)." Keil, Minor Prophets, 291. Accordingly, it is not surprising that the LXX renders סִכּוּת by the aorist, καὶ ἀνελάβετε ("and you carried"), apparently reading the verb as a perfect conjunctive rather than as a perfect consecutive. However, such a use is rare and usually occurs "when two or more verbs are in a closely related series." Williams, 34. The BHS proposes the repointing of the Qal סִכּוּת as the Niphal סִכּוּת, i.e., "you will be lifted up." This emendation would answer the objection raised by Keil. However, it is unnecessary if one takes the position that here סִכּוּת is a perfect consecutive used as a frequentative, i.e., "you used to carry." See Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 339.

<sup>2</sup>Debate exists as to the meaning of the designations, סִכּוּת מַלְכֶּךָ ("Sikkuth, your king") and כִּיּוּן ("Kiyyun"). In the first case, the LXX "takes consonantal MT as 'the tent of Molech,' [perhaps] reflecting a Vorlage without the plural possessive suffix on מֶלֶךְ." Douglas Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, WBC, vol. 31 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 352. However, "the mention of an astral deity (literally, 'star of your god', i.e. 'star-god') gives us the clue that proper names are meant by the Hebrew words. And Mesopotamian texts list the terms Sakkuth and Kaiwanu (which LXX and Acts 7:43 misspell as Rephan) as names of the planet Saturn. The Hebrew vowels in both words, i followed by u, are the result of a familiar device in which names of idols or pagan deities are deliberately misspelled to brand them as shameful or abominable: here the two vowels of šiqqûs, 'a detestable thing', often used to describe idols (e.g. Dt. 29:16; 2 Ki. 23:24; Je. 4:1) were substituted both to label and mock the foreign deities." David Allan Hubbard, Joel and Amos: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989), 185. Accordingly, the Massoretic pointing is not "corrected" here to approximate the Akkadian equivalents, in contrast to Stuart, 352.

That you have made for yourselves?<sup>1</sup>  
 27 I will send you into captivity  
 Beyond Damascus,"  
 Says Yahweh,  
 The God of Hosts [is] his name.

Amos 5:25 is clearly a rhetorical question anticipating a negative response.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis has sometimes been placed upon the prepositional phrase "בְּ", so that the thought in vss. 25, 26 becomes "you did not offer sacrifices and grain-offering to me. Instead, you offered

---

<sup>1</sup>In nondisjunctive double questions, the second member may be connected by a waw or may even have no conjunction at all. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 475. Accordingly, this clause is here translated as a question, as a continuation of the question of Amos 5:25. See Hubbard, 185; Stuart, 352; Wolff, 265. For more information, see below, p. 277, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Joüon, 610, points to Amos 5:25 as an example of the relatively infrequent use of the adverb "וְ" with an exclamatory nuance, "Indeed you offered me sacrifices and oblations in the wilderness!" However, even if an exclamatory nuance is present, the interrogative force of the adverb should not be overlooked here. Waltke and O'Connor, 685. Such is especially the case since Amos repeatedly uses it to introduce "disputation questions, questions to which there can be only one answer." Hubbard, 183. E.g., see Amos 2:11c; 3:3-8; 5:20; 6:2d, 3, 12, 13; 7:2, 5; 9:7.

Amos 5:25 has been interpreted as a rhetorical question anticipating a positive answer, which in turn is qualified in vs. 26. In this case, the thought in the two verses would be, "Yes, you did offer me sacrifices and grain-offering, but it was useless because you also worshiped idols!" E.g., see F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), 155. However, an examination of the disputation questions listed in the preceding paragraph shows that whenever a positive answer is expected, the question is posed in the negative; and conversely that whenever a negative answer is expected, the question is posed in the positive.

them to idols!"<sup>1</sup> However, this interpretation is unlikely, since according to vs. 22, Yahweh does not ask for more sacrifices and grain-offerings, but instead specifically rejects those already being brought to him. The contrast is thus not between offerings made to different deities, but between the offerings of two different time periods. As Shalom Paul summarizes, "Amos is . . . contrasting the lavish and excessive ritual practice of his day with the frugal one that may have existed during those forty years."<sup>2</sup> Indeed,

precisely during this time Israel enjoyed divine grace and benefited from God's protection (Amos 2:10). Yet all of this care and concern was not in any way linked to, or posited upon, any conditions or obligations of cultic worship or fulfillment of ritual prescriptions.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, "Israel's assumption that sacrifices were the *sine qua non* of their religion was mistaken."<sup>4</sup> Amos 5:25 thus lends support to the thesis that laws which apply throughout the wilderness period have priority over the laws that do not.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Keil, Minor Prophets, 291.

<sup>2</sup>Paul, Amos, 194.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 193.

<sup>4</sup>Stuart, 355.

<sup>5</sup>It is true that in the Pentateuch the sacrificial system "began in an inaugural manner during the first year's encampment at Sinai (e.g., Lev 9:8-24)." Stuart, 355. However, Amos 5:21-27 refers to voluntary offerings associated with the pilgrim feasts, and it is equally true that these offerings and feasts "became regular only after the conquest." Ibid. The Pentateuch pictures both the

Like Amos 5:25, vs. 26 is a rhetorical question expecting a negative response.<sup>1</sup> The agreed absence of the worship of Sikkuth or Kiyyun in the wilderness period seems to be used here as an argument against Israel's later worship of the astral deity. As in vs. 25, the wilderness period once again has a special place in the writer's mind.<sup>2</sup>

---

Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Booths as applying only once the land has been entered. See above, p. 241. Furthermore, "the forty years are used as a round number, to denote the time during which the people were sentenced to die in the wilderness after the rebellion at Kadesh, just as in Num. xiv. 33, 34, and Josh. v. 6, where this time, which actually amounted to only thirty-eight years, is given, as it is here, as forty years." Keil, Minor Prophets, 290. During this time, Josh 5:1-10 suggests that the Passover was suspended. See above, p. 266. Notice also the focus on the land in Num 15:2-21; 18:12, 13. See Hubbard, 184. Accordingly, Paul, Amos, 194, is wrong in seeing a contradiction between Amos 5:25 and the Pentateuch.

<sup>1</sup>The frequentative nature of the expression וְשָׁאֲחָם has already been noted above, p. 274, n. 1. In this case, the time reference of Amos 5:26 corresponds to that of vs. 25, and both verses have the same function within the argument of the passage. The rhetorical nature of vs. 26 and its anticipation of a negative response is thus affirmed.

Keil, Minor Prophets, 289-291, accepts that Amos 5:26 is a question, but argues that it is adversative to the question of vs. 25, so that a positive rather than a negative response is now anticipated. However, Amos's use of disputational questions suggests that the question would then have been posed negatively. See above, p. 275, n. 2. In addition, in a disjunctive question, one would expect the second part to be introduced by the adverb אֲבָל. See Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, 475.

<sup>2</sup>For a similar idealization of the wilderness period, see Jer 2:2, 3; Hos 2:14, 15. This idealization contrasts with the reports of Numbers and Deuteronomy. However, "Amos was probably no more naive here than Hosea,

In conclusion, because of the people's hypocrisy, Amos 5:22 rejects the voluntary offerings they bring to the annual pilgrim feasts, but does not negate any of the mandatory dictates of the law. However, Amos 5:25, 26 lends support to the thesis that laws that apply throughout the wilderness period have priority over those that do not.<sup>1</sup>

Amos 8:9, 10

In Amos 8:4-14 four oracles are inserted between the fourth vision (vss. 1-3) and the fifth vision (Amos 9:1-6). The second oracle is found in vss. 9, 10:<sup>2</sup>

והיה ביום ההוא נאם אדני יהוה  
והבאתי השמש בצהרים והחשכתי לארץ ביום אור:  
והפכתי חניכם לאבל וכל־שיריכם לקינה  
והעליתי על־כל־מתנים שק ועל־כל־דאש קרחה  
ושמתיה כאבל יחיד ואחריתה כיום מר

---

who knew well the story of Israel's compromise with the Moabite worship of Baal of Peor (9:10; Nu. 25)." Hubbard, 184. Instead, this idealization "was a way of underscoring how deeply corrupted Israel's present life had become: in contrast to their wicked perversions of worship and ruthless breaches of justice, the old days, with whatever outbursts of complaint or rebellion they may have witnessed, were indeed golden. Devotion was high and distraction low. The commandments were harbored in the ark, and the relationship with God, though strained at times, was intimate." Ibid.

<sup>1</sup>For a summary of how Acts 7:39-42 uses Amos 5:25-27, see Hubbard, 187, 188. He correctly concludes that "Though in many details Stephen departs from Amos' text, in the major thrust of the passage—the obdurate rebellion and idolatry of Israel which resulted inevitably in exile—the two preachers stand shoulder to shoulder." Ibid., 188.

<sup>2</sup>See Paul, Amos, 262, 265.

- 9 "And it shall be on that day,"  
     [is] the utterance of Lord Yahweh,  
 "That I will make the sun go down at noon,  
     And I will make it dark on the earth in full  
     daylight.
- 10 "And I will turn your feasts into mourning,  
     And all your songs to lamentation.  
 And I will cause sackcloth to be lifted up upon all  
     loins,  
     And baldness upon every head.  
 And I will make it like the mourning over an only  
     son,  
     And its end like a day of bitterness."

Amos 8:9, 10 is parallel to Amos 5:18-25 in its dramatic reversal of expectations: in the coming day of judgment darkness will turn into light (Amos 8:9; cf. Amos 5:18-20), just as Israel's feasts will turn into mourning, and their songs into a lamentation (Amos 8:10; cf. Amos 5:21-25). Amos 8:9, 10 thus reinforces what Amos 5:18-25 says, but does not provide any additional indicators of the extent of the applicability of these feasts.

Hos 2:8-13 (Vss. 10-15, Hebrew)

According to Hos 2:6, 7 (vss. 8, 9, Hebrew), Yahweh promises to block off Israel's path to her lovers, so that she will seek him again. This promise is expanded in vss. 8-13 (vss. 10-15, Hebrew):

והיא לא ידעה כי אנכי נתתי לה הדגן והחירוש והיצתר  
 וכדף הרביתי לה וזהב עשו לבעל:  
 לכן אשוב ולקחתי רגלי באתי וחירוש במערו  
 וחצלתי צמרי ופשתי לכסות את ערוותה:  
 ועתה אנלה את נבלתה לעיני מאהביה ואיש לא יצילנה מירי:  
 והשבתי כל משושה חנה חרשה ושבתה וכל מוערה:  
 והשמתי נפנה ותאננה אשר אמרה  
 אתנה המה לי אשר נתנולי מאהבי

ושמתי ליער ואכלתם חית השדה:  
 ופקדתי עליה אתימי הבעלים אשר תקטיר להם  
 ותער נומה וחליטה ותלך אחרי מאהביה  
 ואחי שכחה נאסיהה

- 8 "But she did not know  
     That I gave her  
 The corn and the wine and the olive oil.  
 And I multiplied silver for her,  
     But they produced gold for Baal.
- 9 "Therefore I will take back  
     My corn in its season  
         And my wine at its appointed time.  
 And I will take away my wool and my linen,  
     For covering her nakedness.
- 10 And now I will uncover her nakedness  
     Before the eyes of her lovers,  
         And no one will rescue her from my hand.
- 11 And I will cause her every pleasure to cease:  
     Her feast day, her new moon, and her Sabbath,  
     And her every festival.
- 12 And I will desolate her vine and her fig trees,  
     Of which she said,  
         'They are my wages,  
         That my lovers have given to me.'  
 And I will set them as a thicket,  
     And the beast of the field will devour them.
- 13 And I will visit upon her the days of the Baals,  
     When she offered smoke to them.  
 And she decked on her ring and her jewelry,  
     And went after her lovers,  
 But forgot me,"  
     [is] the utterance of Yahweh.

The statement in Hos 2:11 (vs. 13, Hebrew) about  
 the cessation of sacred times has been read as a direct  
 prediction that none of the Pentateuchal times are to be

observed between the first and second comings of Christ,<sup>1</sup> although exegesis does not support this conclusion.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from Hos 2:11, there are six Old Testament passages where the same sequence of festival (חַן or מוֹעֵד), New Moon (חֲדָשׁ), and Sabbath (שַׁבָּת) is found, either in the same or in reverse order: 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 2:4 (vs. 3,

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Griffith, 139-143; Congdon, 329.

<sup>2</sup>Congdon, 331, does not engage in any exegesis of Hos 2, but simply quotes the assertion of Lewis Sperry Chafer, Grace (Chicago, IL: Bible Institute Colportage Assoc., 1939), 331, that these sacred times "ceased at the beginning of this age of grace, so far as any recognition from God is concerned. Otherwise, when will this prophecy be fulfilled?"

Griffith, 141, 142, gives some reasons why he believes that the prophecy applies to "the interim period between Christ's death and Israel's restoration," but these are philosophical rather than exegetical. He does not explain the immediate relevance of his view to the situation of Hosea and his readers, nor does he explain how the cessation of these sacred times during this period might be related to the withdrawal of agricultural produce or the stopping of Baal worship depicted in Hos 2:6-13. He also asserts that Hos 2:14-23 must be understood as referring to a still future return of Israel from captivity, simply because it has never been fully fulfilled in the past. This reasoning ignores the possibility that aspects of the timing of the prophecy are conditional and the primacy of initial context. See the appendix, "Conditionality, Covenant, and Classical Prophecy," below, pp. 360-302, 377. He also overlooks the fact that in Lam 2:6, 7 the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem is pictured as causing a similar cessation of sacred times, nor does he consider the possibility that the judgment envisaged in Hos 2 might be fulfilled by drought just as easily as invasion. See David Allan Hubbard, Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989), 77; Stuart, 52. Finally, Griffith does not consider what the cessation of these sacred times actually involves, as does this study.



Hebrew); 8:13; 31:3; Neh 10:33; and Ezek 45:17.<sup>1</sup> A similar grouping of these respective terms is found in Num 29-29 and Ezek 46:1-11, albeit with a wider separation between them. Indeed, Num 28-29 appears to provide the pattern "after which most of the . . . [other passages] are modeled."<sup>2</sup> In these last two passages, the word **שבת** clearly refers to the weekly Sabbath, the word **חדש** clearly refers to the New Moon, and the words **חג** or **מועד** clearly refer to annual festive observances, so the same referents are presumably in view whenever this same sequence or its reverse is found.<sup>3</sup> The important point for this study is that in all these parallel passages, the required offerings for these occasions are in focus rather than the days themselves,<sup>4</sup> and thus there is no reason to believe that

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul Giem, "Sabbatōn in Col 2:16," AUSS 19 (1981): 198.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 61, includes Sabbath, New Moon, and Feast alike in the expression, **וכל מועדה** ("and her every festival") in Hos 2:11. However, elsewhere **מועד** is clearly used as a technical term for an annual festival (see above, p. 87), and thus the phrase **וכל מועדה** is probably not all-inclusive here either. See Gerhard F. Hasel and W. G. C. Murdoch, "The Sabbath in the Prophetic and Historical Literature of the Old Testament," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assoc., 1982), 46.

<sup>4</sup>Giem, 199, 200.

the situation is any different in Hos 2:11.<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion, in Hos 2:11, Yahweh is pictured as threatening to stop the people from offering sacrifices for the weekly, monthly, and annual sacred times, by taking away the produce needed to offer them. The prescribed staple of the cult is clearly included in the threat, and not just voluntary offerings. Accordingly, while the goal of the divine action in Hos 2:8-13 is to place a limitation on Israel's Baal worship, this action also effectively suspends the divinely ordained sacrifices of Yahweh worship.<sup>2</sup> The limitation on these features of Yahweh worship is not seen as permanent,<sup>3</sup> so no temporal limitation on their observance per se is anticipated. Nevertheless, the sacrificial cultus is clearly ranked as a secondary rather than a primary feature of true religion.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 199, 200. Gien concedes that "Hosea may also be referring to the offerings on those days . . . in 2:11," but then adds, "I feel that it is more probable that either Hosea was speaking of both the days and their offerings or he did not have the offerings, as such, in mind." Ibid., 200. However, he does not give any reason why he thinks Hos 2:11 should constitute the sole exception to the pattern he discerns elsewhere in the Old Testament.

<sup>2</sup>Compare the parallel statement in Hos 3:4, where Israel is deprived of both legitimate and illegitimate institutions, just as Hosea's wife is deprived of both legitimate and illegitimate intercourse in vs. 3. See Hans Walter Wolff, Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea, trans. Gary Stansell, Herm (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1965), 62.

<sup>3</sup>This limitation presumably lasts only as long as the deprivation of the land's agricultural produce. See Hos 2:15-22; J. J. M. Roberts, "Hosea and the Sacrificial Cultus," Restoration Quarterly 15 (1972): 26.

There is no indication of the relationship between the sacrifices required for these days and the observance of the days themselves.

Hos 9:1-6

Hos 9:1-6 contains limitations in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.

On the immediate context of Hos 9:1-6, Stuart notes that Hos 8

ended with a prediction of judgment based on a description of Israel's sins. Chap. 9 begins a new scene, as evidenced by the direct address in v 1 (and also v 5) and the emphasis upon a nation optimistically celebrating festival days.<sup>1</sup>

Hos 9:1-6 emphasizes that Israel's "prostitution" at the feasts will produce famine and captivity, and that there will be no feasting in captivity and desolation:<sup>2</sup>

אל־הַשְׂמַח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־נִיל כַּעֲמִים  
כִּי זִנִּית מֵעַל אֱלֹהֶיךָ  
אֲהַבְתָּ אֲחֻנָּן עַל כָּל־עֲרֻנוֹת דָּגָן:  
נָרַן וַיִּקֶּבּ לֹא יִרְעֶם וְהִירֹשׁ יִכְחַשׁ בָּהּ:  
לֹא יֵשֶׁב בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה  
וְשָׁב אֲפֻרִּים מִצִּרִּים וּבְאֲשׁוּר שָׂמָא יֹאכְלוּ:  
לֹא־יִסְכּוּ לִיהוּדָה יֵין וְלֹא יַעֲרֹבְדּוּ זִבְחֵיהֶם  
כֹּלֶחֶם אוֹנִים לֶחֶם כָּל־אֲכָלִיו יִשְׂמָאוּ  
כִּי לֶחֶמָם לִנְפֶשָׁם לֹא יָבֹא בֵּית יְהוּדָה:

---

<sup>1</sup>Stuart, 140.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 139.

מהתעשו ליום מועד וליום חגיהוה:  
 כיהנה הלכו משר מצרים הקבצם מן הקברים  
 מחמר לכספם קמוש יירשם חוח באהליהם

- 1 Do not rejoice, O Israel,  
 Do not be glad like the nations,<sup>1</sup>  
 For you have prostituted yourself away from  
 your God.  
 You have loved [your] fee,  
 Upon all the threshing floors of grain.
- 2 From threshing floor and winevat he will not feed  
 them.<sup>2</sup>  
 And he has caused wine to fail in her.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In harmony with the poetic style of the passage, this translation points אל as the negation אל instead of the preposition אל. The LXX seems to read the text the same way. The form ניל is here understood as "an infinitive absolute used as a jussive." Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 24 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1980), 522. However, "the infinitive absolute is usually negated with לו, not אל," and accordingly "the MT pointing could be an artificial way of avoiding such complications by identifying gyl as a noun and ל as a preposition." Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Traditionally the phrase נרן ויקב is rendered as the subject of ירעם, leading to the translation of the line as "Threshing floor and wine vat will not feed them." However, the subject would then be plural and the verb singular, a discord which "suggests that God is the subject of the verb in v 2," (see vs. 1), and that "the nouns are instrumental or 'accusatives of specification.'" Ibid.

The LXX apparently reads לא ירעם ("will not know them") instead of לא ירעם ("will not feed them").

<sup>3</sup>As Andersen and Freedman note, "Khš usually means 'to deceive,' but in Hab 3:17 a similar idea is met: kihēš ma<sup>c</sup>āšēh-zayit, 'The olive crop has failed.' . . . The Piel here is used causatively." Ibid. To this comment it should be added only that in view of Waltke and O'Connor, 437, 438, it would be more precise to say that the Piel is here used factitively rather than causatively, thus stressing the suddenness of the event.

As for the prepositional phrase בה ("in her"), "since 9:1 is addressed to Israel as 'you,' there is no immediate antecedent for 'them' or 'it/her.'" If c 9 picks

- 3 They will not live  
In the land of Yahweh.  
And Ephraim will return to Egypt,  
And in Assyria they will eat unclean food.
- 4 They will not pour out wine to Yahweh,  
And their sacrifices will not be pleasing to him.<sup>1</sup>  
[They will be] like mourner's bread to them,<sup>2</sup>  
Everyone who eats will be unclean.  
For their bread [will be] for their life,  
He will not enter the house of Yahweh.<sup>3</sup>
- 5 What will you do,  
On a festive day,  
And on the day of the Feast of Yahweh?
- 6 For behold they have walked from destruction,  
[But] Egypt will gather them together,  
[And] Memphis will bury them.

---

up the themes of cc 1-3 (and the verb *zny* suggests this), then 'she' and 'they' could be the mother and the children once more, both standing for Israel. Some manuscripts and versions read 'them' in both lines, but this is the result of leveling, and not the original reading." Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 524.

<sup>1</sup>Two Massoretic manuscripts read *יִעְרְבוּ* instead of *יִעְרְבוּ*, leading to the alternate translation of the line as, "And they [the people] will not set out their sacrifices for him."

<sup>2</sup>On the translation of *לֶחֶם אוֹנִים* as "mourner's bread," see Stuart, 144. For an alternative view, see Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 526, 527.

<sup>3</sup>The subject of *לֹא יָבוֹא* ("he/she/it will not come") has traditionally been identified with *לֶחֶם* ("their bread") in the immediately preceding line. However, "persons, not things, . . . are the usual subjects of 'to come'; the *Hip'il* would be used for bringing things into the house. Since the usage in Hebrew is consistent—people enter, things are brought—the translation 'It shall not come' (*RSV*) is erroneous." Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 528. Accordingly, the mention of Ephraim in Hos 9:3 is the most likely referent here. *Ibid.*

Given the use of the plural expression, *לֹא יִשְׁבוּ*, in vs. 3, there is perhaps merit in the suggestion "that the verb was originally pl, *יָבוֹאוּ* 'they will (not) enter,' the consonants being reversed in transmission to *יָבוֹא* 'it will (not) enter.'" Stuart, 140.

As for their treasure of silver,<sup>1</sup>  
Weeds will dispossess them,  
[And] thorns [will be] in their tents.

"The feast of Yahweh" (חַג יְהוָה) in Hos 9:5 has generally been identified with the Feast of Booths,<sup>2</sup> although J. Pedersen identifies it with Passover.<sup>3</sup> Hos 9:1-9 probably summarizes words spoken at a particular feast.<sup>4</sup> However, the most straightforward reading of Hos 9:6 is to see a reference here that encompasses all the annual pilgrimage feasts.<sup>5</sup>

The denouncement of Hos 9:1-6 is directed against the idolatrous celebration of the feasts, rather than

---

<sup>1</sup>I.e., their idols. See Hos 2:10; 8:4; 13:2; Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, 531. The expression מַחְמֹר לְכֶסֶם ("their treasure of silver") has here been read as a casus pendus anticipating the third person plural suffixes in the rest of the sentence, as in the NASB.

The LXX translates Hos 9:6 with radically different boundaries from the Massoretic text, taking מִצְרַיִם as the genitive of the word שָׂר, the name מִי as the subject of חֲקִבָּם, and מַחְמֹר לְכֶסֶם as the subject of חֲקִבָּם. In other words, "the people will walk away from the destruction of Egypt, Memphis will gather them, and their treasure of silver will bury them."

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, 528, 529; Hubbard, Hosea, 158; Stuart, 144; Wolff, Hosea, 153, 156; James Luther Mays, Hosea: A Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1969), 125.

<sup>3</sup>J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, vols. 3-4, trans. Annie I. Fausbøll, rev. ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1940; Copenhagen: Povl Branner, 1940), 445, 446.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., see Hubbard, Hosea, 156; Stuart, 141.

<sup>5</sup>Scott 46, 47, quoted above, p. 271, n. 2.

against the feasts per se. However, the threatened punishment would be just as disruptive to a legitimate exercise of the cult as to its idolatrous perversion.<sup>1</sup> In Hos 9:4, the prophet and his audience alike assume that the offering of the festal sacrifices will be impossible once access has been denied to "the house of Yahweh" (בֵּית יְהוָה), a term probably designating the land of Yahweh rather than a specific building.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, there may be a concession here to the decentralization of the pilgrim feasts under adverse circumstances.<sup>3</sup> However, the audience is expected to agree that the offering of festal sacrifices will not survive the loss of both land and sanctuary.

The rhetorical question of Hos 9:5 clearly anticipates the negative answer, "nothing." The audience is thus expected to concede that once captivity and desolation have made the offering of festal sacrifices impossible, the feasts themselves will cease.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, Hos 9:5 supports the thesis that the observance of the three annual pilgrim feasts is dependent upon the operation of the sacrificial system.

---

<sup>1</sup>Wolff, Hosea, 155.

<sup>2</sup>As in Hos 8:1; 9:15. See Wolff, Hosea, 155; Andersen and Freedman, Hosea, 520, 528, 529; Hubbard, Hosea, 158; Mays, 126.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 96-101.

<sup>4</sup>Hubbard, Hosea, 155.

In conclusion, Hos 9:1-6 affirms that the pilgrim feasts presuppose the possession of either land or sanctuary, and that their observance is dependent upon the operation of the sacrificial system.<sup>1</sup>

Isa 1:10-17

As a part of the covenant confrontation of Isa 1:2-20, vss. 7-9 picture Judah's future desolation as an already accomplished fact. Vs. 9 laments that if it were not for Yahweh's grace in sparing "a few survivors" (שְׁרִיד כְּמַעֲטָה), "we would have become like Sodom/ we would have been like Gomorrah."<sup>2</sup> Vs. 10 strengthens the analogy by moving from simile to metaphor, and directly identifying

---

<sup>1</sup>Of course, postbiblical Judaism has in varying degrees retained the observance of Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Booths, in spite of the loss of land, temple, and sacrificial system. This fact is a tribute to Judaism's creativity, flexibility, and adaptability. However, from this analysis of Hos 9:1-6, it is clear that this perpetuation may involve such a radical reinterpretation of the feasts that they no longer have any real continuity with their Old Testament counterparts. As far as the Worldwide/Radio Church of God is concerned, Lowe lists the chief Old Testament festivals, then comments that "if any group attempted the literal observance of this formidable list of festivals today, the absence of animal sacrifice and the impossibility of the prescribed ritual, the irrelevance of much of the typology to a nonpastoral people, and the cessation of the . . . Levitical priesthood would render the feasts and festivals meaningless. They would have to be changed and adapted beyond recognition. In fact, this changing has been done in Radio Church of God observances." Lowe, 125. This comment on this church's observance of the three annual pilgrim feasts might be equally applicable to their continued observance in Judaism.

<sup>2</sup>כְּסֹדֶם הָיִינוּ לְעֹמֶרָה רַמְיָנוּ.



the people addressed in the denunciation of vss. 11-17 as "rulers of Sodom" (קציני סדם) and as "people of Gomorrah" (עם עמרה).

Isa 1:11, 12 has two rhetorical questions, both expecting negative responses:

למה לי רב־זבחים יאמר יהוה  
 שבעתי עולות אילים וחלב מריאים  
 ודם פרים וכבשים ועתודים לא חפצתי:  
 כי תבאו לראות פני  
 מי בקש זאת מידכם רמס חצרי

- 11 "Why the multiplication of your sacrifices to me?"  
 Says Yahweh.  
 "I have had my fill of burnt offerings of rams,  
 And of fatlings' fat,  
 And the blood of bulls, and rams,<sup>1</sup> and goats  
 I do not care for.  
 12 "When you come to appear before me,<sup>2</sup>  
 Who sought this from your hands,  
 The trampling of my courts?"

Isa 1:13, 14 specifically addresses the issue of weekly, monthly, and annual sacred times:

לא תוסיפו הביא מנחת־שוא קשרת תועבת היא לי  
 חדש ושבת קרא מקרא לא־אוכל און ועצרה:  
 חדשיכם ומועדיכם שנאה נפשי  
 היו עלי לטרח נלאיתי נשא

- 13 "Do not bring vain grain-offering anymore,  
 It is an abominable smoke to me.

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX omits any translation of the phrase וכבשים ("and rams"), perhaps in an attempt to preserve a parallel with the two-part listing of the previous bicolon.

<sup>2</sup>Alternatively, the Niphal לראות could be repointed as the Qal לראות leading to the translation "When you come to see my face," instead of "When you appear before me." This is the reading reflected in the Syriac version.

- New Moon and Sabbath, proclaiming a proclamation,  
I cannot bear wickedness and an assembly.
- 14 "Your New Moons and your Festivals,  
My soul hates.  
They have become a burden upon me,  
I have become tired of bearing [them]."

In Isa 1:15-17, the people's prayers are rejected  
and the reasons for Yahweh's weariness with Israel's  
worship are explained:

ובפרשכם כפיכם אעלים עיני מכם  
גם כי־תִּרְבּוּ חַפְלָה אֵינִי שֹׁמֵעַ  
יְדֵיכֶם דְּמִים מְלֹאִי: רַחֲצֵי הַזֶּכֶּה  
הַסִּירוּ רַע מֵעַלְלֵיכֶם מִנֵּר עֵינִי  
חַדְלוּ הָרַע: לַמְדוּ הַיָּשָׁב  
דְּרֹשׁ מִשְׁפָּט אֲשֶׁר־חַמּוּץ  
שִׁפְטֵי יְתוֹם רִיבֹה אֶלְמָנָה

- 15 "And when you spread out the palms of your hands,  
I will hide my eyes from you,  
Even if you should multiply prayers,  
I will not be listening.  
Your hands are full of blood.<sup>1</sup>
- 16 Wash [them], make [them] clean.  
Take the evil of your lips  
Away from my eyes.  
Stop doing evil,  
Learn to do good.
- 17 Seek judgment,  
Straighten out the ruthless.  
Rule in favor of the orphan,  
Contend for the widow."

Isa 1:13, 14 has long been used as evidence of the  
abolition of the Sabbath.<sup>2</sup> However, the focus of Isa 1:10-

---

<sup>1</sup>The Dead Sea Scrolls Isaiah manuscript adds  
אֶצְבְּעֵיכֶם בַּעֲוֹן ("your fingers are full of iniquity"). See  
John D. W. Watts, Isaiah 1-33, WBC, vol. 24 (Waco, TX: Word  
Books, 1985), 14.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., see Barnabas, chap. 15, as early as the  
second century CE.

14 is clearly on the offerings brought on the sacred times listed, rather than on the sacred times themselves. It thus cannot be assumed that the total suspension of any sacred time is called for here, unless it is also assumed that it is dependent upon the continuation of the offerings listed here.

From Isa 1:13's description of the grain-offering as "vain," it is clear that the passage is not opposed to offerings per se. Instead, it is opposed to the hypocritical multiplication of offerings, when the disregard of the ethical ideals of vss. 15-17 has rendered them useless. Nevertheless, the question of whether the mandatory offerings are included in its condemnation is important for this study, since if only voluntary offerings are in view, this passage simply expresses the priority of what the law requires over what it merely permits and encourages. On the other hand, if mandatory offerings are also in view, this passage also expresses the priority of ethical law over some of the mandatory aspects of ritual law, just as in Hos 2:8-13 (vss. 10-15, Hebrew).

The position that only voluntary offerings are in view in Isa 1:10-17 has been vigorously defended,<sup>1</sup> and certainly, elsewhere in the Old Testament, the terms זבחים

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., by John H. Hayes and Stuart A. Irvine, Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1987), 75.

("sacrifices") and עֹלֹת ("burnt offerings") are only ever used together to refer to voluntary offerings.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, in the last part of vs. 11 there is a general repudiation of the blood of bulls, rams, and goats, suggesting that the whole sacrificial cultus is here critiqued. Likewise, Isa 1:13, 14 uses the three terms, חַרְשׁ/חַרְשִׁים ("[your] New Moon[s]"), שַׁבָּת ("Sabbath"), and מוֹעֲדִים ("your festivals")—terms that are elsewhere used in combination to include the regular staple of the cultus.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, Isa 1:10-17 reinforces this study's findings in support of the priority of ethical law over some of the mandatory aspects of the ritual law.

In conclusion, like Hos 2:8-13, Isa 1:10-17 focuses on the offerings for the weekly, monthly, and annual sacred times, and like Hos 2:8-13, it ranks the sacrificial cultus as a secondary rather than a primary feature of true religion. There is no indication of the relationship between the sacrifices required for these days and the observance of the days themselves, just as in Hos 2:8-13.

---

<sup>1</sup>Milgrom, "Repudiation of Sacrifice," 273-275.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 282. The main difference between Isa 1:13, 14 and the other passages where the three terms occur is that here there is no "smooth sequence." Instead, "there are two groups of two terms each." Giem, 200.

Sabbaths and Feasts in Lam 1:4 and 2:6, 7

Each verse of Lam 1 is a separate stanza.

According to vs. 4:

דרכי ציון אבלות מבלי באי מועד  
כל-שעריה שוממין כהניה נאנחים  
בתולתיה ננות והיא מרלה

The paths to Zion [are] mourning,  
For none [are] coming for the festival.  
All her gates [are] desolate,  
Her priests [are] sighing,  
Her virgins [are] depressed,<sup>1</sup>  
And it [is] bitter for her.

This verse clearly predicts the absence of pilgrimage to Jerusalem for her festivals after her devastation. However, it does not address the issue of whether festive celebration will still be able to continue outside Jerusalem. Furthermore,

whether the first line of the verse implies the complete cessation of religious festivals . . . must be open to question. . . . The city cannot be completely "deserted" if there are **priests** in it waiting for pilgrims and people in it searching for food (v. 11), nor can all the **maidens** be grieving if some of them have "gone into captivity" (v. 18). **None come to the appointed feasts** may therefore be an exaggeration.<sup>2</sup>

Each verse of Lam 2 is a separate stanza.

According to vss. 6, 7:

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX translation, ἀγόμενοι, clearly reflects the reading נהונוה ("led away") rather than ננות ("depressed"). In fact, "there is little to choose between the two possibilities." Iain W. Provan, *Lamentations*, NCBC (London: HarperCollins-Religious, Marshall Pickering, 1991; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1991), 40.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

ויחמס כנן שכו שחת מועדו  
 שכח יהוה בציון מועד ושבת  
 וינאץ בזעם־אפו מלך וכהן:  
 זנח אדני מזבחו נאך מקדשו  
 הסניד ביר־אויב חומת ארמנותיה  
 קול נחנו בבית־הוה כיום מועד

- 6 And he has torn down his booth like the garden,<sup>1</sup>  
 He has ruined his festival,<sup>2</sup>  
 Yahweh has caused to be forgotten in Zion  
 Festival and Sabbath.  
 And he has despised in his indignation  
 King and priest.
- 7 The Lord<sup>3</sup> has rejected his altar,  
 He has abandoned his sanctuary.  
 He has shut with an enemy's hand  
 The wall of her palaces.  
 They have raised a sound in the house of Yahweh,  
 Like a festive day.

The first part of Lam 2:6 presents Yahweh himself as having ruined a celebration of the Feast of Booths "by destroying *his booth*/cutting off his branch, that is the temple/Zion, the focal point of the celebrations."<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, the second part of Lam 2:6 presents the results

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX reading, ὡς ἄμπελον, is based on reading כנמן ("like a vineyard") instead of כנן ("like the garden").

<sup>2</sup>On the basis of the parallelism between Lam 2:6a and vs. 6b, the term מועדו ("his festival") has been interpreted as a reference to a religious festival rather than to an appointed place of worship. See Provan, 64.

<sup>3</sup>Many manuscripts have יהוה ("Yahweh") instead of אדני ("Lord")—an understandable substitution since in the Massoretic tradition the two terms are vocalized and read as אדני.

<sup>4</sup>Provan, 66. For evidence that the Feast of Booths due immediately after the destruction of the Temple is in view, see idem, "Feasts, Booths, and Gardens (Thr 2,6a)," ZAW 102 (1990): 254, 255.

of the destruction of Jerusalem for the larger calendar: Yahweh has caused Festival and Sabbath to be forgotten in Zion.<sup>1</sup>

The references to the king and the priest in Lam 2:6, and to the Lord's rejection of his altar and sanctuary in vs. 7, suggest that it is the cultic function of these times that has been forgotten,<sup>2</sup> whether for voluntary or obligatory offerings. The question of the extent to which they can survive the loss of such a function is not addressed by this passage.

#### The Feasts and Joel 1:9, 13, 16

Joel 1:2, 3 contains a call to reflection, and vs. 4 contains a vivid description of an agricultural tragedy. Vss. 5-18 consist of a series of four calls to mourn over the tragedy, each one addressed to a different group: the drunkards in vss. 5-7; the general populace in vss. 8-10; the farmers in vss. 11, 12; and the priests in vss. 13-18.<sup>3</sup>

The tragedy is first pictured as having a dramatic effect on Yahweh's house in Joel 1:9, as part of the call for the general populace to mourn:

הכרת מנחה ונסך מבית יהוה  
אבלו הכהנים משרתי יהוה

---

<sup>1</sup>Provan, Lamentations, 66.

<sup>2</sup>H. J. Boecker, Klagelieder, ZBAT, no. 21 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985), 47.

<sup>3</sup>For more information, see Stuart, 240.

Grain-offering and drink-offering have been cut off  
 From the house of Yahweh.  
 The priests are mourning,  
 The ministers of Yahweh.

It is next pictured as having a dramatic effect on the  
 house of God in Joel 1:13, as part of the call for priests  
 to mourn:

חגרו וספרו הכהנים הלילו משרתי מזבח  
 באו לינו בשקים משרתי אלהי  
 כי נמנע מבית אלהיכם מנחה ונסך

Gird yourselves and wail, O priests,  
 Howl, O ministers of the altar.  
 Go, spend the night in sackcloth,  
 O ministers of Yahweh,  
 For it is withheld from the house of my God,  
 Grain-offering and drink-offering.

The same point is reiterated as part of the same call to  
 mourn in Joel 1:16:

הלוא נגר עיינינו אכל נכרת  
 מבית אלהינו שמחה וניל

[Is] it not before our eyes,  
 [that] food has been cut off,  
 From the house of our God,  
 Joy and gladness?

A strong case has been made that the Sitz im Leben  
 of Joel is the Feast of Booths.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not this  
 thesis is accepted, the cutting off of מנחה ("grain-  
 offering") and of נסך ("drink-offering") "from the house of  
 Yahweh/your God" in Joel 1:9, 13 implies an agricultural

---

<sup>1</sup>See Kathleen Sarah Nash, "The Palestinian  
 Agricultural Year and the Book of Joel" (Ph.D.  
 dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1989).



disaster of enormous magnitude, which would undermine both the voluntary and obligatory offerings for the whole cultus.<sup>1</sup>

The question of the extent to which any particular sacred time can survive the loss of this aspect of their observance is not addressed in Joel 1.

### The Feasts and Mal 2:1-9

Mal 2:1-9 is a command specifically addressed to the priests (vs. 1). Vs. 2 warns of a curse if they do not obey, a curse that is already underway. The coming judgment and its purpose are described in vss. 3, 4:

הנני נער לכם את הזרע וזריתי פרש על-פניכם פרש חניכם ונשא אחכם אליו:  
וידעתם כי שלחתי אליכם את המצוה הזאת להיותי אתלוי אמר יהוה צבאו

3 "Behold I [am] rebuking your seed,<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Hubbard, Joel and Amos, 46.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX translation, ἀφορίζω τὸν ὄμνον, is probably based on reading נרע ("separating") instead of נער ("rebuking") and on repointing הַזֶּרַע ("the seed") as הַזֶּרַע ("the arm"). See Ralph L. Smith, Micah-Malachi, WBC, vol. 32 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 310. However, in the LXX the verb ἀφορίζω "is used as a translation of fifteen different Hebrew words, but never gāḏa<sup>c</sup>. The Greek translators obviously conjectured the meaning of the Hebrew text, and consequently provided an inconsistent translation." Pieter A. Verhoef, The Books of Haggai and Malachi, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1987), 242.

The term הַזֶּרַע ("the seed") may refer to either offspring or crop seed, and a good case has been made that a double meaning is intended. In other words, it is argued that "a steady decline in [both] numbers and income" is envisaged here. See Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 233.

- And I will scatter offal upon your faces—  
 The offal of your feasts.<sup>1</sup>  
 4 "You will be lifted up to it,<sup>2</sup>  
 And you will know that I have sent this command  
 In order to maintain<sup>3</sup> my covenant  
 with Levi,"  
 Says Yahweh of hosts.

Vss. 5-9 present an idealized picture of Levi's adherence to the covenant in contrast to the breach of it by the priests of Malachi's day. "From God's side the covenant means life and peace, and from Levi's side the obligation

---

<sup>1</sup>"The invective of the eighth-century prophets against the cultus . . . was polite by comparison." Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 233.

<sup>2</sup>"This sentence is deemed a crux interpretum." Verhoef, 242. The BHS apparatus proposes an emendation to וְנִשְׂאֵנִי אִתְּכֶם מֵעַלִי ("and I will lift you away from me") on the basis of the LXX and the Syriac. However, "there really is no need to alter the Hebrew text. . . . The subject is impersonal or indefinite: 'one,' 'someone,' or 'they,' usually rendered by the passive. The expression nāsā' el is used in various contexts in the sense of 'lifting up to, in the direction of.' The suffix in 'ēlāyw refers back to 'dung,' but then in the sense of the 'dunghill,' the place outside the camp where the ashes are thrown (Lev. 4:11). The intention is that the priests will be carried by 'them' or 'one' (even God) to that place outside the camp where the dung and other matter are deposited." Verhoef, 243.

<sup>3</sup>On the basis of a parallel with 1 Sam 2:31, it has been proposed that the expression לְהִיּוֹת ("to maintain") be emended to the privative מִלְּהִיּוֹת. Accordingly, the purpose of the address becomes the nullification rather than the continuation of the covenant with Levi. Théphane Chary, O.F.M., Aggée-Zecharie-Malachie, Sources bibliques (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969), 251. However, there is no textual support for this emendation, and "of the many references to broken covenants in the prophets, in every case it is men who fail to keep covenant (e.g. Is. 24:5; 33:8; Je. 11:10; 31:32; Ezk. 44:7)." Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 234. Accordingly, the Massoretic reading is retained in this translation.

presupposes unlimited subjection in reverence and the fear of the Lord."<sup>1</sup>

The only other explicit Old Testament reference to the "covenant with Levi" is in Jer 33:20, 21, which suggests that it must have been established early in Israel's history, but does not indicate any formal act of its establishment.<sup>2</sup> The best explanation for the development of the idea of a covenant with Levi is probably that with the passage of time, "experience of the constancy of God's saving purpose and appreciation of the work of the Levites" is taken as a specific example of Yahweh's covenant concern for the people as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

As for the maintenance of the covenant with Levi in Mal 2:4b,

should God just let everything run its course, then he himself would be removing his "covenant with Levi." But because he takes this covenant seriously, he punishes the breach of the covenant by the priests and thus makes provision on his part ("my covenant") that it remains in force. With the priests being eliminated from this covenant through their sins, God can call a new high priest and a new priestly people.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Verhoef, 245.

<sup>2</sup>Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 244, 245. On the significance of Jer 33:14-26 for this dissertation, see below, p. 369, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 234.

<sup>4</sup>"Würde Gott alles nur laufen lassen, dann würden er selbst seinen **Bund mit Levi** aufheben. Aber weil er diesen Bund ernst nimmt, bestraft er den Bruch des Bundes durch die Priester und sorgt gerade so dafür, daß er seinerseits (»mein Bund«) **in Kraft bleibt**. Scheiden dann die Priester durch ihre Sünde aus diesem Bund aus, kann

Malachi does not directly envisage the abrogation of the sacrificial system per se, for in Mal 3:3, 4 a purified priesthood and acceptable offerings are envisaged. However, the dramatic festal removal of the priests from office in Mal 2:3, along with the exclusive stress on ethical rather than ritual matters in vss. 5-9, indicates that ethical rather than ritual law is the center of the covenant with Levi.

The Pentateuchal Sacred Times in the  
Eschatology of the Prophets

In the Prophets four passages predict a prominent place for one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory: Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19. It is obvious that these passages have never been literally fulfilled in the past, and accordingly it is hardly surprising that some interpreters who take the authority of Scripture seriously have seen these passages as direct indicators of the continued applicability of these sacred times.<sup>1</sup> In other words, these passages have been cited in support of the

---

Gott einen neuen Hohenpriester und ein neues Priestervolk berufen." Gerhard Maier, Der Prophet Haggai und der Prophet Maleachi, WSAT (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1985), 141.

<sup>1</sup>For example, God's Festivals and Holy Days, 33. 34, 43, uses Zech 14:16 as evidence of the continued present applicability of the Feast of Booths, and SDABC, 1:802 cites Isa 66:22, 23, as evidence that the Sabbath "will remain after sin is no more."

permanence of one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo.

This argument neglects the original context in which the predictions are given and ignores the element of conditionality attached to the fulfillment of many of their details. In particular, conditionality affects the identity of those who will share in the covenant blessings, and the time of the fulfillment of classical prophecy. This last factor is of special interest, for in a delayed fulfillment, it cannot be assumed that details specific to the original setting will be completely or literally realized. For example, a literal realization of the prophetic descriptions of the sacrificial cultus or of nationalism cannot be automatically expected, nor can the literal application of ethnic and geographic designations and their associated ritual boundaries. Accordingly, the passages examined in this section are not subject to the first criterion.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, even though these passages are not subject to the first criterion, they may still be subject to one or more of the other four criteria used in this

---

<sup>1</sup>See the appendix, "Conditionality, Covenant, and Classical Prophecy," below, pp. 360-377.

dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary.

### The Sabbath in Isa 56:1-8

The divine speech of Isa 56:1-8 is a call to ethical living in view of the coming revelation of divine salvation or righteousness. As vs. 1 states

משפט ועשו צדקה  
כה אמר יהוה שמרו  
כיקרובה ישועתי לבוא וצדקתי להגלות

Thus says Yahweh,  
"Keep judgment and do righteousness,  
For my salvation [is] close to coming,  
And my righteousness to being revealed."

"My *salvation* and my *righteousness* in this context refer to accomplishments through the Persian [king]: rebuilding the Temple, restoring Jerusalem, and restitution of land-rights for Jews."<sup>1</sup>

The third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the identity of those who participate in observing a sacred time, and in terms of this criterion, Isa 56:1-8 affirms the universal applicability of the Sabbath in the strongest possible language.

The call to ethical living in Isa 56:1 is elaborated in vs. 2:

---

<sup>1</sup>Watts, Isaiah 34-66, 248.

אשרי אנוש יעשה זאת ובן־אדם יחזיק בה  
שמר שבת מחללו ושמר ידו מעשות כל־דע

"Happy is a person who does this,  
And a human being who lays hold of it,  
Keeping Sabbath from polluting it,  
And keeping his hand from doing any evil."

The universal scope of this blessing is evident in the use of the universal terms for humanity: אדם and אנוש instead of איש.<sup>1</sup> However, lest there be any misunderstanding, Isa 56:3 announces the inclusion of two groups who otherwise might not be considered to be the particular objects of blessing: the foreigner who has allied himself with Yahweh and the eunuch.

ואלי־אמר בן־הנכר הנלוה אלי־הוא לאמר  
הברל יברילני יהוה מעל עמו  
ואלי־אמר הסרים הן אני עץ יבש

"And let not the son of the foreigner speak,  
The one who has allied himself to Yahweh,<sup>2</sup> saying,  
'Surely Yahweh has separated me from his  
people.'  
And let not the eunuch say,  
'Look, I [am] a dry tree.'"

---

<sup>1</sup>Yamashiro, 190.

<sup>2</sup>The Massoretic text points נלוה as a perfect (נָלָה), although since it is preceded by the article, it should be pointed as a participle (נִלְוֶה), as reflected in the LXX rendering, ὁ προσεῖμμενος. See BDB, 531. For more information on the expression נלוה אלי־הוא here and the expression נלוים עלי־הוא in Isa 56:6, see J. Blenkinsopp, "Second Isaiah--Prophet of Universalism," JSOT 41 (June 1988): 102, n. 34.

Isa 56:4, 5 elaborates upon the blessing on the eunuch. However, it is the elaboration of the blessing upon the foreigner in vss. 6-8 that is of particular importance to this study:

ובני הנכר הנלוים עליהוה  
 לשרתו ולאהבה אתשם יהוה להיות לו לעבדים  
 כלשומר שבת מחללו ומחזיקים בבריתי:  
 והביאותים אלהר קרשי ושמחתים בבית תפלתי  
 עולתיהם וזבחייהם לרצון עלמזבחי  
 כי בייתי ביתתפלה יקרא לכלהעמים:  
 טאם אדני יהוה מקבץ נדחי ישראל  
 עוד אקבץ עליו לנקבציו

- 6 "The sons of foreigners who ally themselves with Yahweh,  
 To minister to him and to love the name of Yahweh,  
 To be servants to him,  
 Everyone keeping<sup>1</sup> Sabbath from polluting it,  
 And those laying hold of my covenant—
- 7 "Them will I bring to my holy mountain,  
 And I will make them glad in my house of prayer.  
 Their offerings and their sacrifices [will be] acceptable upon my altar,<sup>2</sup>  
 For my house will be called a house of prayer for all peoples,"
- 8 [Is] the utterance of Lord Yahweh,  
 Who is gathering the scattered ones of Israel.  
 "I will gather still others to him,"  
 [In addition] to those [already] gathered by him."

---

<sup>1</sup>The Dead Sea Scrolls have the plural participle, שמרי ("those who keep") instead of the singular participle, שמר ("one who keeps").

<sup>2</sup>The combination of the terms עולות and זבחים specifically refers to voluntary offerings. Milgrom, "Repudiation of Sacrifice," 273-275. In an assimilation to Isa 60:7, the Dead Sea Scrolls, followed by the Targum, adds the verb יעלו ("they will offer").



In Isa 56:1-8, "Sabbath keeping, though important, is not the only and ultimate sign of true religion."<sup>1</sup> Instead, the specific obligation to observe the Sabbath is set in the context of broader generic duties (vs. 2).<sup>2</sup> However, it is noteworthy that in Isa 56:6, 7 there is no attempt to place the foreigner who allies himself with Yahweh under any obligation to observe the whole Mosaic law. Instead, the religious ideal held up for Gentiles consists of just three things: "pure monotheism, moral life, and the Sabbath."<sup>3</sup> This ideal is in harmony with emphases found in the rest of the Old Testament and stresses the universal applicability of the Sabbath.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 233.

<sup>2</sup>Blenkinsopp, 94, against Exod. Rab. 25:12, which reads Isa 56:2 as though refraining from desecrating the Sabbath were the equivalent of refraining from all evil.

<sup>3</sup>Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," 102. See also Moore, 1:267. Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1968), 422, sees a specific reference to circumcision in the reference to the foreigner laying hold of the covenant in Isa 56:6. However, this position is untenable, given the parallel blessing upon eunuchs who lay hold of Yahweh's covenant in vs. 4. Instead, the parallelism within vs. 6 itself suggests that the expression "my covenant" refers to the Sabbath, just as in Exod 31:16.

<sup>4</sup>Commenting on "the law of the assembly" in Deut 23:2-9 (vss. 3-10, Hebrew), Blenkinsopp, 94, states that "the combination of foreign proselytes and the sexually mutilated suggests very strongly that the misgivings expressed in Isa. 56.1-8 arose from the threatened application of this law. In which case . . . we would have an example of the abrogation of a point of torah on prophetic authority, an interesting and potentially very important precedent." Blenkinsopp, 94. However, the law on the sexually mutilated in Deut 23:2 (vs. 3, Hebrew) "is

The fourth criterion to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time, and

---

probably not intended to bar from the community those whose state of mutilations had been brought on by accident or illness," nor those whose state had been brought on by forcible castration as an induction to the service of a foreign king. Craigie, Deuteronomy, 296, 297. Instead, it is intended to bar those who mutilate themselves as an act of devotion to another god, and "thus, in Isa. 56:3-5, the eunuch (*sārīs*) is by no means cut off from the blessing of God; if the castration was not self-imposed, it implied nothing concerning a man's religious commitment." Ibid., 297, n. 5. In addition, "the offering of sacrifice in the temple of Jehovah is not only permitted in the Mosaic law to foreigners living in Israel, but to some extent prescribed (Lev. xvii. 10, 12; Num. xv. 13 sqq.). It was only in the paschal meal that no *גֵּר* was allowed to participate (Ex. xii. 43). To do this, he must first of all be circumcised (ver. 44). Solomon accordingly prays to the Lord in his temple-prayer that He will also hearken to the prayer of the foreigner, who may come from a distant land for the Lord's name's sake to worship in His house (1 Kings viii. 41 sqq.)." C. F. Keil, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel, vol. 2, trans. James Martin (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., n.d.), 189. See also 2 Chr 6:32, 33; Dillard, 53.

Blenkinsopp, 95, 96, contrasts the prohibition against foreigners entering the temple in Ezek 44:1-14 with Isa 56:7. However, the subject in Ezek 44:1-14 is the employment of foreigners to care for the holy things of the sanctuary, and not the use of the temple as "a house of prayer for all people," as in Isa 56. Ibid. See also Brooks Schramm, The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration, JSOTSS, no. 193 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 121, 122.

In the Pentateuch, the uncircumcised *גֵּר* is expected to observe the Sabbath. See above, pp. 127, 128, 149. Accordingly, Isa 56:3, 6, 7 just extends the principles applied to the *גֵּר* living among the Israelites in the Pentateuch to the foreigner (*גֵּר*) aligning himself with Yahweh but living outside Palestine: an appropriate extension in view of the greater importance such foreigners would have for Israel in an exilic and postexilic situation.

in terms of this criterion, although the promises of Isa 56:5-7 relate to the temple, Sabbath observance is still pictured as preceding any gathering there. In other words, the Sabbath in Isa 56 has a geographically universal applicability, presupposing neither the occupation of the land nor the operation of the temple.

In conclusion, Isa 56:1-8 stresses that the Sabbath is universally applicable to those who ally themselves with Yahweh, irrespective of whether they are circumcised, and pictures the Sabbath as presupposing neither the occupation of the land nor the operation of the temple.

#### New Moon and Sabbath in Isa 66:22, 23

Isa 66:22-24 forms the poetic conclusion of Isaiah. According to vss. 22, 23:

כי כאשר השמים החדשים והארץ החדשה אשר אני עשה  
עמרים לפני נאמיהוה כן יעמר זרעכם ושמכם:  
והיה מדיחדש בחדשו ומדי שבת בשבתו  
יבוא כל־בשר להשתחוה לפני אמר יהוה

- 22 "For as the new heavens  
And the new earth that I [am] making  
[Will] stand before me," is the utterance of  
Yahweh,  
"So will your seed and your name stand.  
23 "And it will be from one New Moon to another,  
And from one Sabbath to another,<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Duhm, Jesaja, 489, suggests that the terms חדש and שבת here may designate the month and the week respectively. In other words, the assembling before Yahweh is to occur "from one month to another, and from one week to another." Ibid. However, "although such a reading does make sense here, it is doubtful that Sabbath and new moon should be used in that way in this single place." Andreassen, Old

That all flesh will come  
To worship before me," says Yahweh.

Isa 66:22, 23 affirms a universal observance of both the New Moon and the Sabbath,<sup>1</sup> and thus contains no limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe it.<sup>2</sup>

---

Testament Sabbath, 40.

<sup>1</sup>It has been argued that in Isa 66:23, the expression כל בשר ("all flesh") refers only to the Jews, even though in vs. 16 it encompasses all people, just as it has been argued that the title מַשְׁעִים ("transgressors") in vs. 24 refers only to apostate Jews, even though starting in vs. 15 it refers to Yahweh's enemies as a whole. So D. Karl Marti, Das Buch Jesaja, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, vol. 10 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900), 414. However, this argument presupposes that Isa 66:23 is a late addition to the text, whereas on literary grounds it is clearly an intrinsic part of the section beginning in vs. 18—a passage that in turn is surely a doublet of vss. 15-17. Eberhard Sehmsdorf, "Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jesaja 56-66 (II): (Jes 66 17-24)," ZAW 84 (1972): 567, 568. Accordingly, Isa 66:23 does have universal overtones.

<sup>2</sup>It has been argued that the Sabbath in Isa 66:23 is not directly applicable to the Gentiles per se, but is instead a sign of their subjugation to national Israel: "Even when it will be an enforced command that all flesh recognize the Sabbath in some way (Isa 66:23) yet it will be only in relation to Israel, the ruling nation at that time (Isa. 60:12). The Sabbath keeping of the nations as mentioned in Isaiah 66:23 is in connection with their representative worship in Jerusalem and their homage to the ruling Jewish nation." Congdon, 427, 428. This argument is parallel to the one used in this dissertation with reference to Zech 14:16-19. See below, pp. 316, 317. However, its application in the context of Isa 66:23 is inappropriate. It is true that the focus of most of Isa 40-66 is on a universal imperium rather than universal equality. Blenkinsopp, 83-103. However, in the context of

The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time, and in terms of this criterion, there is no indication in Isa 66:22, 23, of whether or not the observance of either the New Moon or the Sabbath presupposes the continued operation of the sacrificial cultus.

#### The Sacred Times in Ezek 45:17-46:15

Ezek 45:17-46:15 is the part of Ezekiel's Temple Vision (Ezek 40-48) that prescribes the different offerings

---

Isa 66, universal equality is in view, as is demonstrated by the promise of vs. 21, וְנִסְמָתָם אֶחָד לַכֹּהֲנִים לְלִוִּים אָמַר יְהוָה ("And also from among them I will take [some] as Levitical priests," says Yahweh). The antecedent of "them" (הֵם) could be either the Gentiles who are the grammatical subject of vs. 20a or the dispersed remnant whom they bring to Jerusalem. Geoffrey W. Grogan argues for the latter position: "It is not impossible grammatically that the words of v. 21 apply to the Gentiles, which, in this case, would anticipate the Pauline teaching that there is no barrier to blessing or to privilege in Christ (e.g., Gal 3:28-29). It seems more likely, however, that they apply to priests and Levites selected from among the regathered brothers mentioned in vs. 20." Geoffrey W. Grogan, "Isaiah," *EBC*, ed. Frank E. Gaebeline, Regency Reference Library (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1986), 6:353. However, Isa 66:21 clearly does apply to the Gentiles, "since there would be nothing remarkable about Jews, even diaspora Jews, exercising these functions." Blenkinsopp, 103, n. 51. Universal equality is also clearly in view in Isa 56:1-8. *Ibid.*, 93-96.

Of course, Isa 66:22, 23 says nothing of other factors that may limit the observance of either the New Moon or the Sabbath. In the Pentateuch, there is no evidence that the obligation to observe the New Moon is independent of the continued operation of the sacrificial cultus (see above, p. 151), and the sacrificial cultus is pictured as continuing in Isa 56:7 and 60:7. Accordingly, Isa 66:22, 23 cannot be used as a basis for arguing for the continued observance of the New Moon in a context where the sacrificial system may no longer be operative.

the ~~נשיא~~ or prince is to provide in the new temple for the celebration of the Sabbath, the New Moon, and a number of different sacred times in the temple. However, there is no indication of whether these sacred times are still to be observed in the absence of the temple, the sacrificial cultus, or the land.<sup>1</sup>

The calendar presented in Ezek 45:17-46:15 differs from any in the Pentateuch. First, there is an emphasis on the first and seventh days of the first month not found in the Pentateuch (Ezek 45:18-20). Second, while the Feast of Ingathering/ Weeks, the Festival of Trumpets, and offerings for the Day of Atonement are prescribed in the Pentateuch, but not in Ezek 45-46. For rabbinic interpreters, these differences have been a source of considerable consternation,<sup>2</sup> while in the standard critical approach to interpretation, conflicting understandings within the canon

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, Ezek 45:7-12 allots the prince's land, and insists that he not oppress the people for their land. Ezek 46:16, 17 returns to this theme by insisting that any land given by the prince to his servants should be returned to him in "the Year of Liberty" (שנת הרדור—vs. 17), or the Pentateuchal Year of Jubilee. Conversely, vs. 18 stresses that the people's inheritance should not be claimed by the prince's sons. However, these verses do not provide any criteria used to establish whether "the Year of Liberty" is permanent or temporary.

<sup>2</sup>Notice the summary of rabbinic interpretations provided by Steven Shawn Tuell, "The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48" (Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1989), 2, 3.

come as no surprise and do not need to be harmonized.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it has been argued that the apparent omissions and additions in Ezekiel may simply be intended "to intimate that the ceremonial was not a finality and forever unalterable."<sup>2</sup> In other words, these differences have been seen as a limitation of at least some of the Pentateuchal sacred times, in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem.

There is no dispute that Israelite history makes provision for the institution of new festivals.<sup>3</sup> Instead, the real question for this study is whether Ezek 45-46 also envisages the abolition of old ones, and in response to this question, it is clear that omission here cannot necessarily be equated with abolition. Accordingly, although Ezek 45-46 does not mention the Day of Atonement, Ezek 40:1 seems to have it in mind when it dates the Temple

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 277.

<sup>2</sup>Green, 237.

<sup>3</sup>"The differences in these festival calendars inform us that Israel's observance of the various feasts was not static, but dynamic. This understanding is confirmed by the continued expansion of the feasts in Israel's history with the addition of a Purim (Esther) and Hanukkah." Hartley, 377.

Vision on the tenth day of the new year.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, Ezek 45-46 may not mention the Feast of Weeks/Ingathering, the Festival of Trumpets, and the Day of Atonement, simply because in the new temple the Prince is not expected to provide the offerings for these days.<sup>2</sup>

In conclusion, Ezek 45:17-46:15 does not provide any indication of the possible terminus ad quem of the Pentateuchal sacred times, nor does it provide any other criteria to establish which sacred times might be permanent and which might be temporary.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Day of Atonement is dated to the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev 16:29; 23:27; 25:9; Num 29:7), the tenth day of the new year in a fall-to-fall calendar. It has been argued that Ezek 40:1 might just as readily be using a spring-to-spring instead of a fall-to-fall calendar. E.g., see Walther Eichrodt, Ezekiel: A Commentary, trans. Cosslet Quinn, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1970), 540. However, it is more likely that a fall to fall calendar is in fact in view. E.g., see William H. Shea, "The Investigative Judgment of Judah, Ezekiel 1-10," in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshar (Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists), 283, 291; Leslie C. Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, WBC, vol. 29 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990), 229. In Ezek 40:1, the designation ראש השנה ("head of the year") may designate the month as a whole as the beginning of the year. See Eichrodt, 540. On the other hand, it may designate the tenth day of the month as the beginning of the year, just as the Day of Atonement begins the Jubilee year in Lev 25:10.

<sup>2</sup>Hartley, 337.



The Festival/Feast of Booths  
in Zech 14:16-19

Zech 14:1-15 depicts an eschatological battle in which the nations attack Jerusalem but suffer defeat at Yahweh's hands, and vss. 16-21 speak of the subsequent pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem. Vss. 16-19 are of special interest to this study because they picture the defeated nations as observing the Feast of Booths each year in Jerusalem. In other words, vss. 16-19 seem to lack any limitation in terms of the third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who participate in observing it.

והיה כל־הנותר מכל־הגוים הבאם על־ירושלם  
ועלו מדי שנה בשנה להשתחות למלך יהוה צבאות  
ולחג אֶת־חג הסוכות:

והיה אשר לא־יעלה מאת משפחות הארץ אל־ירושלם להשתחות למלך יהוה צבאות  
ולא עליהם יהיה הנשם: ואם־משפחת מצרים לא־תעלה ולא באה ולא עליהם תהיה  
המנפה אשר ינף יהוה את־הגוים אשר לא יעלו לחג אֶת־חג הסוכות: זאת תהיה חטאת  
מצרים וחטאת כל־הגוים אשר לא יעלו לחג אֶת־חג הסוכות

- 16 And it will be [that] any who are left over from  
among all the nations,  
Who have come against Jerusalem,  
That they will go up from year to year,  
To worship the King, Yahweh of Hosts,  
And for the feast: the Feast of Booths.
- 17 And it will be [that] whoever from among the clans  
of the earth does not go up to Jerusalem to worship  
the King, Yahweh of Hosts, upon them there will be  
no rain.

- 18 If the clan of Egypt will not go up and has not come, upon them [there will] be none.<sup>1</sup> There will [instead] be the plague with which Yahweh will strike the nations who will not come up for the feast: the Feast of Booths.
- 19 This will be [the result of] the sin of Egypt and [the result of] the sin of all the nations who will not come up for the feast: the Feast of Yahweh.

In the Pentateuch, aliens are encouraged to observe the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Deut 16:14), but their attendance at the central shrine is not commanded the way that the Israelite male is (Exod 23:17; 24:33; Deut 16:16). The booths themselves are a commemoration of Israel's wilderness experience (Lev 23:42, 43), so even though generosity to aliens is commanded, the feast remains a distinctively Israelite feast, with no sanction attached to their not participating. However, in Zech 14:16-19, the defeated nations are required to observe the Feast of Booths in Jerusalem under penalty of receiving no rain and being struck by plague.

It has been claimed that the application of this festival to the nations demonstrates an "extraordinary

---

<sup>1</sup>Some manuscripts, followed by the LXX and the Syriac, simply have עליהם instead of ולא עליהם. In other words, instead of having a separate clause, "that [there will be] none upon them," these manuscripts attach the prepositional phrase עליהם ("upon them") to the subsequent clause, leading to the following translation of vs. 18: "And if the clan of Egypt will not go up and has not come, the plague will be upon them, with which Yahweh will strike the nations who will not come up for the feast: the Feast of Booths."

reversal in the coming meta-historical scheme,"<sup>1</sup> and "a step toward dissolving boundaries rather than maintaining them."<sup>2</sup> However, the insistence that they observe the feast simply appears to be an ironic transformation of a symbol of shared blessing into a symbol of their subjugation to Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> In other words, there may be a form of universalism here, but it is the universalism of a universal imperium rather than that of universal equality, as rabbinic Judaism has long recognized.<sup>4</sup> There is no indication that it would still be observed in a setting

---

<sup>1</sup>Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, Zechariah 9-14, AB, vol. 25C (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1993), 465.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 506.

<sup>3</sup>Note especially the extended nature of the threat in Zech 14:17-19. H. C. Leupold argues that "we may go so far as to claim that it presents a merely hypothetical case. . . . The situation is regarded as practically unthinkable. . . . Since the final outcome of things is being depicted, and since in the consummation all evil and ungodliness will have been entirely overcome, it would be quite out of keeping with the spirit of the passage to conclude that after the judgment has been carried out wicked man and sinners will still be met with in the new heavens and the new earth." H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Zechariah (Wartburg Press, 1956; reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1971), 274. However, this is a case of using a priori presuppositions concerning the nature of the eternal state to be a rubric for determining what is literal and what is figurative rather than the text itself. See below, p. 362.

<sup>4</sup>In rabbinic Judaism, the Feast of Booths is not only the time to pray that the nations will receive rain, but also for Yahweh to justify his people and condemn the nations. See above, p. 40. Compare how Blenkinsopp, 83-92, argues that much of Isa 40-66 focuses on a universal Israelite imperium rather than on universal equality, but not Isa 56:1-8 or Isa 66:21. See also above, p. 309, n. 2.

where the ethnic, geographic, and nationalistic elements of the prophecy no longer literally apply.<sup>1</sup>

The Pentateuchal Sacred Times in Other  
Old Testament Passages

There are a number of other Old Testament passages that mention one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times. In this part of the chapter, attention is given only to those passages that provide criteria to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary.<sup>2</sup> The use of the word מועדים in Ps 104:19 is examined first, followed by specific sacred times in descending order of frequency: the Sabbath first, followed by the Festival of Trumpets and the Feast of Booths/Ingathering, and then the Sabbatical Year.

---

<sup>1</sup>On the conditional nature of these elements of prophecy, see below, pp. 372-374.

<sup>2</sup>The Sabbath plays an important role in Jer 17, while the Sabbath and possibly the Day of Atonement figure prominently in Isa 58. Reference is made to "my Sabbaths" (שבתותי) in Ezek 23:38, and to "my festivals" (מועדי) and "my Sabbaths" (שבתותי) in Ezek 44:24. Ps 92 is entitled "a song for the Sabbath day" (מזמור שיר ליום השבת) and the last stanza of Ps 104 (vss. 31-35) also seems to allude to the Sabbath. See Doukhan, Creation Story, 85. 2 Chr 30 refers to the observance of Passover in Hezekiah's day, 2 Chr 35 and 2 Kgs 23:21-27 refer to its observance in Josiah's day, and Ezra 6:19-22 refers to its observance after the dedication of the temple. There are also possible allusions to the Sabbatical Year and to the Jubilee in Isa 37:30; Isa 61:1-4; Dan 9:24-27. However, none of these passages clarifies the issue of whether the sacred times mentioned are permanent or temporary.

## The מוערים in Ps 104:19

A sequential parallel may be drawn between the seven days of the creation account of Gen 1:1-2:1-3 and the seven stanzas of Ps 104.<sup>1</sup> Ps 104:19 occurs in the fourth stanza, and corresponds to Gen 1:14.

עשה ירח למוערים שמש ירע מבואר

He [Yahweh] made the moon for appointed times;  
The sun knows its times for setting.

If the term מוערים here refers to annual festivals, Ps 104:19 would support the argument that they are a creation ordinance, and accordingly a prima facie case would exist for their permanence in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. However, the מוערים in Ps 104:19 are most likely the circadian and annual rhythms of nature, as in Gen 1:14.<sup>2</sup>

## The Sabbath

Ezek 20:10-26

Ezek 20:2-41 represents the divine refusal to provide the oracle sought by some of the elders of Israel

---

<sup>1</sup>See Doukhan, Creation Story, 84, 85.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 89. The circadian rhythm particularly appears to be in view here, given the poetic parallelism between the מוערים and the times for the setting of the sun.

in vs. 1. This refusal is broached in vs. 3 and confirmed by the accusations of vss. 30, 31. Vss. 5-29 recount what vs. 4 calls "the abominations of their fathers" (תועבת אבותם) as an historical preamble to these accusations.<sup>1</sup> This preamble may be divided into four sections respectively recounting Israel's rebellion in Egypt (vss. 5-9), the rebellion of the first wilderness generation (vss. 10-17), the rebellion of the second wilderness generation (vss. 18-26), and the rebellion of the fathers after entering the land (vss. 27-29). The Sabbath is an issue in the second and third sections of Ezek 20:5-29: vss. 10-17 and vss. 18-26.<sup>2</sup>

The third criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary concerns the identity of those who participate in observing it. In terms of this criterion, it should be noted that Ezek 20:18-26 accuses the second wilderness generation of Sabbath-breaking, whereas the period after the exclusion of the first generation from the promised land is elsewhere pictured as a time when the distinctively Israelite boundary markers of circumcision and Passover observance

---

<sup>1</sup>See Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 5.

<sup>2</sup>The expression "my Sabbaths" (שבתותי) in Ezek 20:12, 13, 16, 20, 21, is a technical designation for the weekly Sabbath, as in Lev 23:37, 38. See above, p. 96.

are suspended.<sup>1</sup> In other words, Ezek 20:18-26 provides evidence that the Sabbath is not an Israelite ritual boundary incumbent only upon those who have been circumcised.<sup>2</sup>

In Ezek 20:10-26, the obligation to observe the Sabbath applies in the wilderness period, prior to the entry into the promised land. Accordingly, there is no geographic limitation here in terms of the fourth criterion used to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its continued observance.

In conclusion, Ezek 20:10-26 presents the Sabbath as an institution whose applicability is not confined to those who are circumcised, nor limited to the promised land.

#### Neh 9:13, 14

Neh 9:5b-38 consists of historical recitation, of which vss. 13, 14 are a part:

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 265, 266, on Josh 5:1-10. On the concept of ritual boundary, see above, p. 82.

<sup>2</sup>At first sight, the specific statement that Yahweh's Sabbaths are a sign between him and the people in Ezek 20:11, 20 seems to suggest that the Sabbath is intended only for Israel. However, there is no more reason to see this limitation in these verses than in Exod 31:13. On the parallelism between Ezek 20:11, 20 and Exod 31:13, see Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB, vol. 22 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1983), 366. On the concept of ritual boundary, see above, p. 82. On Exod 31:13, see above, p. 134.

ועל הר סיני ירדת ודבר עמם משמים  
 ותתן להם משפטים ישרים  
 ותורות אמת חקים ומצות טובים:  
 ואת שבת קדשך הורעת להם  
 ומצות וחקים ותורה צוית להם ביד משה עבדך

- 13 And you came down upon Mount Sinai,  
 And spoke<sup>1</sup> judgments with them.  
 And you gave to them  
 Upright judgments,  
 True laws,  
 Good statutes and commandments.
- 14 And your holy Sabbath  
 You made known to them,  
 And you commanded them commandments and statutes  
 and a law,  
 By the hand of Moses your servant.

At first sight, this passage seems to suggest that the Sabbath is instituted only at Sinai. A *prima facie* case would thus exist that it is only temporary in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus a quo. However, you can make known something that is completely new, or you can make known something that has been completely forgotten. In addition, the verb ידע in the Old Testament is not just used with reference to knowing identity, but also with reference to knowing the character

---

<sup>1</sup>The infinitive absolute plus waw conjunctive form, וַיְדַבֵּר ("and spoke"), here continues the preceding perfect form, יָרַדְתָּ ("you came down"). See Joüon, 430-432.



of a person or thing.<sup>1</sup> The thought in Neh 9:13, 14 may thus be that although the Exodus generation knows of the Sabbath before Sinai, it does not know its true significance until the Sinai revelation. In this case, there would be no need to see this passage either as contradicting Exod 16 and its picture of Sabbath observance before Sinai, or as dealing imprecisely with chronological detail. Accordingly, this passage provides no criteria to establish whether the Sabbath is permanent or temporary.

Neh 10:31 and 13:15-22

Neh 10:31 (vs. 32, Hebrew) prohibits any selling in Jerusalem on the Sabbath or on any other holy day, and Neh 13:15-22 gives a specific instance of the application of this principle to the Sabbath day. Accordingly, these passages might be subject to the third criterion used to establish whether sacred times are permanent or temporary: that which concerns the identity of those who observe them.

The obligations of the covenant document of Neh 9:38-10:27 are explained in relationship to the weekly Sabbath, holy days, and the Sabbatical Year in Neh 10:31 (vs. 32, Hebrew):

ועמי הארץ המביאים את המקלות וכל־שבר ביום השבת למכור לאזנקה מהם בשבת  
וביום קרש ונמש את־השנה השביעית ומשא כל יד

---

<sup>1</sup>See Kaiser, "Exodus," 342.

And as for the peoples of the land<sup>1</sup> who bring wares and every type of grain to sell on the Sabbath day, we will not buy from them on the Sabbath or on a holy day, and we will forego [the crops] on the seventh year, and every hand [will forego] the usury.

In Neh 13:15, the people of Judah are observed selling their produce in Jerusalem on the Sabbath day. In vs. 16, the Tyrians are observed doing the same thing:

והצרים ישבו בה מביאים ראג וכל־מכר ומכרים בשבת לבני יהודה ובירושלם

And the Tyrians<sup>2</sup> lived there,<sup>3</sup> bringing in fish and every kind of merchandise, and selling on the Sabbath to the sons of Judah, and in Jerusalem.<sup>4</sup>

Neh 13:17-22 describes Nehemiah's decisive actions to prevent the continuation of these practices.

Unfortunately, neither Neh 10:31 nor Neh 13:15-22 clarifies whether the prohibition against non-Jews selling on the Sabbath or holy days is primarily meant to be a means of including the alien in the Sabbath rest, or

---

<sup>1</sup>In context, the expression "the peoples of the land" (עמי הארץ) refers to the inhabitants of Palestine during the Exile and their descendants. Some of these people may have Israelite forebears, but their syncretism made it inappropriate to intermarry with them. See Ezra 6:21; Neh 10:28 (vs. 29, Hebrew); Kidner, Ezra and Nehemiah, 22, 143-146.

<sup>2</sup>For a negative evaluation of attempts to discredit the reference to Tyrians in Neh 13:16, see Andreasen, Old Testament Sabbath, 29, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>Literally, "in her," i.e., "in Jerusalem." See vs. 15.

<sup>4</sup>In a case of haplography, some Massoretic manuscripts, followed by the Syriac, Vulgate, and the Arabic version, omit the connective waw ("and") before the prepositional phrase, בירושלם ("in Jerusalem").

whether it is primarily meant to prevent the Jews from buying on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, these verses do not provide any criteria to establish whether the Sabbath is permanent or temporary.

The Festival of Trumpets and the Festival/  
Feast of Booths/Ingathering in  
Ps 81:3 (Vs. 4, Hebrew)

Immediately after the superscription at the beginning of Ps 81 comes a series of exhortations to praise Yahweh, concluding in vs. 3 (vs. 4, Hebrew):

חֲקְעוּ בַחֲדָשׁ שׁוֹפָר בַּכֶּסֶף לַיּוֹם חֲנֻנִי

Sound aloud the horn at the new moon,  
At the full moon, on the day of our feast.<sup>2</sup>

Both the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths begin on the fifteenth of the month, at full moon. However, the trumpet to be blown in Ps 81:3 is the horn (שׁוֹפָר) blown at the Festival of Trumpets, rather than the silver trumpet to be blown each new moon in Num

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Blenkinsopp, Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1988), 359, argues for the first position, but does not consider that buying might be considered just as much work as selling.

<sup>2</sup>Many Massoretic manuscripts, followed by the Syriac and the Targum, have the plural חֲנֻנֵי ("our feasts") instead of the singular חֲנֻנִי ("our feast"), as if Ps 81:3 enunciated a general principle. However, the evidence is that the Feast of Ingathering/Booths is specifically in view, rather than the feasts in general, as is now demonstrated.

10:2.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the reference here must be to the Festival of Trumpets and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths, the latter being especially in focus in Ps 81:6-16 (vss. 7-17, Hebrew).<sup>2</sup>

Ps 81:3 underscores the role of the Festival of Trumpets as a preparation for the observance of the Feast of Booths, and thus contains a limitation in terms of the fifth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times.

The Sabbatical Year in 2 Chr 36:20, 21

The description of the destruction of Jerusalem starting in 2 Chr 36:17 concludes in vss. 20, 21:

יָנַל הַשְּׂאִרִית מִן־הַחֶרֶב אֶל־בָּבֶל וַיְהִי־לָו וּלְבָנָיו לְעֹבְדִים עַד־מֶלֶךְ מַלְכוּת פָּרְס:  
לְמַלְאוֹת דָּבָר יְהוֹה בְּפִי יִרְמְיָהוּ עַד־דַּצְתָּהּ הָאָרֶץ אֶת שְׁבֻתֹתֶיהָ כְּלִי־מִי הַשְּׂמָה שְׁבֻתָּהּ  
לְמַלְאוֹת שְׁבִיעִים שָׁנָה

20 And he took those who had escaped from the sword captive to Babylon, and they became servants for

---

<sup>1</sup>See Anderson, 588.

<sup>2</sup>These verses do not just focus on the deliverance from Egypt, but on the whole wilderness experience, just as the reference to the Feast of Booths in Lev 23:39-45 does. See above, p. 210. The agricultural dimension of this feast is evident in the concluding verse, **וַיֹּאכִלֵהוּ מִחֶלֶב חֹמֶה** **וּמִצֹּר רֶבֶשׁ אֲשֶׁבִיעַךְ** ("But I would feed you from the fatness of wheat/ And from the rock I would satisfy you with honey").

- him and his sons, until the kingdom of Persia<sup>1</sup> began to rule,  
 21 to fulfil the word of Yahweh by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had received restitution for her Sabbaths.<sup>2</sup> All the days of [her] desolation she kept Sabbath, to fulfil seventy years.

Although the seventy-year period is derived from Jer 29:10, the concept of the land receiving restitution for her Sabbaths reflects Lev 26:34, 35, 43. Accordingly, like Lev 26, 2 Chr 36:20, 21 stresses the special relationship between the Sabbatical Year and the land, and thus contains a limitation in terms of the fourth criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the constituent elements necessary for its observance.<sup>3</sup>

### Summary

On the issue of ethical versus ritual law, a number of Old Testament passages outside the Pentateuch express the priority of ethical law over ritual law. Many of these passages imply only the priority of what the law mandates over the voluntary offerings it merely permits and

---

<sup>1</sup>The LXX substitutes *Μῆδον* ("Media") for *Περσία* ("Persia"), either term being a synecdoche for the joint kingdom.

<sup>2</sup>The LXX adds the infinitive, *σαββατίζουσα*, which would lead to the translation, "until the land had received restitution by observing her Sabbaths."

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 222, 223.

encourages,<sup>1</sup> but others suggest the priority of ethical law in more general terms, by suggesting the temporal relativity of the details governing the sanctuary ritual (Isa 66:3), or by anticipating the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood (Ps 110:1, 4) and the sacrificial system (Ps 40:6-8; Jer 31:33, 34; Dan 9:27).

A number of prophetic passages suggest interruptions to the observance of various sacred times, but most of these passages have the sacrifices associated with them in view, rather than the times per se.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, they do imply the priority of ethical law over ritual law in general. Isa 1:10-17; Amos 5:21-27; and Mal 2:1-9 explicitly condemn the hypocrisy of simultaneously observing ritual law and disregarding ethical law. Amos 5:21-27 affirms the historical relativity of those laws that do not apply throughout the wilderness period.

On the issue of the sacred times in particular, five possible criteria have been developed in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: criteria that relate respectively

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., 1 Sam 15:22; Ps 69:30, 31 (vss. 31, 32, Hebrew); Prov 21:3; 15:18; Eccl 5:1 (4:17, Hebrew); Jer 6:19, 20; 7:21-23; 11:14, 15; Hos 6:6; Mic 6:6-8. Compare how Ps 50 contrasts sacrifices offered to manipulate the Deity with genuine thanksgiving offerings.

<sup>2</sup>Hos 2:8-13 (vss. 10-15, Hebrew); Isa 1:10-17; Lam 1:4; 2:6, 7; Joel 1:9, 13, 16; Mal 2:1-9.

to the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time; the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding its terminus a quo; the identity of those who observe it; the constituent elements necessary for its observance; and its interrelationship with other sacred times. A summary can now be made of the evidence outside the Pentateuch in terms of these five possible criteria.

The first criterion concerns the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, four passages in the Prophets predict a prominent place for one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory: Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19. It is obvious that these passages have never been literally fulfilled in the past, and accordingly they have sometimes been interpreted as evidence of the perpetuity of the sacred times. However, this argument neglects the original context in which the predictions are given and ignores the element of conditionality attached to the fulfillment of many of their details. Conversely, it has been argued that the omissions and additions to the listing of feasts in Ezek 45:17-46:15 may be intended "to intimate that the ceremonial was not a finality and forever unalterable."<sup>1</sup> However, it is clear that omission here cannot necessarily be equated with abolition.

---

<sup>1</sup>Green, 237.

The second criterion concerns the canonical picture of the terminus a quo of a sacred time. However, outside the Pentateuch, the Old Testament contains no evidence subject to this criterion.

The third criterion concerns the identity of those who observe a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, there is no attempt in Isa 56:6, 7 to place the foreigner who allies himself with Yahweh under the obligation to observe the whole Mosaic Law. Instead, the religious ideal held up for Gentiles consists of just three things: "pure monotheism, moral life, and the Sabbath."<sup>1</sup> Universal equality is also evident in the prediction that "all flesh" will observe the New Moon and the Sabbath in Isa 66:22, 23. Zech 14:16-19 predicts that one day the defeated nations will observe the Feast of Booths. However, this case constitutes an example of universal imperium rather than universal equality, and there is no indication that it would still be observed in a setting where the ethnic, geographic, and nationalistic elements of the prophecy no longer literally apply.

The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the omission of any reference to the Day of Atonement in 2 Kgs 8:65, 66; 2 Chr 7:9, 10, and Ezra 3:1-6 illustrates how the obligation to observe it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," 102.



dependent upon the continued operation of the sanctuary, just as Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of the <sup>7</sup> or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system, and on the possession of either the land or the sanctuary. On the other hand, in Isa 56:6, 7, the Sabbath is presented as an institution that stands independent of the possession of either land or temple, just as it is presented as an institution that stands independent of the possession of the land in Ezek 20:11-16. 2 Chr 36:20, 21 stresses the special relationship of the Sabbatical Year to the land.

The fifth criterion concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times. In terms of this criterion, Ps 81:3 underscores the role of the Festival of Trumpets as a preparation for the observance of the Feast of Booths.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Despite the valuable contributions of numerous scholars, there is a lack of adequate study of Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of Old Testament laws in general. It is this lacuna that this dissertation has attempted to fill, with particular reference to Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

The question of the extent of the applicability of the weekly Sabbath has been vigorously debated by both Jews and Christians, ancient and modern, and in these debates some attention has been given to the issue of Old Testament indicators of the extent of its applicability. However, no systematic study appears to have been given to searching out and evaluating indicators of the extent of its applicability throughout the Old Testament as a whole.

Despite the efforts of Maertens, Jordan, and some seventh-day Sabbatarians, little attention has been given to finding Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of the other Pentateuchal sacred times, let

alone to systematically comparing and contrasting such indicators with those for the weekly Sabbath.

The main body of the dissertation consists of two chapters: chapter 2 considers indicators of the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times found in the Pentateuch itself, and chapter 3 considers such indicators as they are found elsewhere in the Old Testament. The findings of these two chapters may now be integrated and analyzed.

On the issue of ethical versus ritual law in general, the vertical sanctuary typology of Exod 25:9, 40 implies that the earthly sanctuary and its rituals point beyond themselves to a cosmic-scale enactment, and the repetition of the earthly ritual cycle year after year without effecting permanent atonement implies that a cosmic-scale, effectual reality is forthcoming. The second implication is confirmed by a comparison of Gen 1-3 and Lev 16 in terms of the narrative strategy of the Pentateuch as a whole—a comparison which shows that the ritual of the Mosaic tabernacle is only a temporary measure enacted until a priesthood is established offering full and permanent access to the divine presence. This variability in access is further illustrated by a comparison of the relationship

between God and Israel before and after her worship of the golden calf.<sup>1</sup>

Especially in Deuteronomy, the Decalogue is set apart by certain distinctive features vis-à-vis other Pentateuchal legal formulations, such as who originally wrote it,<sup>2</sup> the material it is written on,<sup>3</sup> and where it is kept.<sup>4</sup> The tripartition of the law into moral, ceremonial, and judicial law cannot be supported from the use of three different legal terms in Deut 6:1. However, a study of legal terms used in Deuteronomy does confirm the distinct status of the Decalogue.<sup>5</sup> The literary structure of Deut

---

<sup>1</sup>On the change in the priesthood after the worship of the golden calf, compare Exod 32:26-28 and Num 3:12. On the change in the tabernacle's function as a symbol of the divine presence, compare Exod 27:21; 28:43; 29:42, 43 and Exod 33:7; 36:6-8.

<sup>2</sup>God rather than Moses. Deut 10:4; 31:9, 24.

<sup>3</sup>On stone rather than in a book. Deut 10:3; 31:24.

<sup>4</sup>In the Ark of the Covenant rather than on the side of it. Deut 10:5; 31:26.

<sup>5</sup>Deuteronomy always uses the terms חקת/חקים ("statutes"), משמרתה ("charge"), מצוה (singular), משפטים, and עדה ("testimonies") to refer to the contents of Deut 6-26, and never to the Decalogue of Deut 5. Conversely, whenever Deuteronomy speaks of law as ברית ("covenant"), it refers exclusively to the Decalogue. E.g., Deut 4:13; 5:2, 3; 9:9, 11, 15; 10:8; 17:2; 29:25 (vs. 24, Hebrew); 31:9, 16, 20, 25, 26; as opposed to Deut 29:1 (Deut 28:69, Hebrew); 29:9, 12, 14, 21 (vss. 8, 11, 13, 20, Hebrew). On the other hand, the plural מצות ("commandments") designates either the Decalogue of Deut 5 (e.g., Deut 5:10, 29; 6:17; 7:9; 8:2; 13:5), or Moses' promulgation in Deut 6-26 (e.g., Deut 4:2, 40; 6:2; 8:6, 11; 10:13; 11:1, 13, 27, 28; 13:18 [vs. 19, Hebrew]; 26:17, 18; 28:1, 9, 13, 15, 45; 30:8, 10,

5:2-29 sets the Decalogue apart as the fundamental statement of law that Deut 12-26 elaborates. Likewise, the subtle differences between Deut 6:1 and Deut 12:1 suggest the historical relativization of those laws which apply throughout the wilderness period to those laws which become applicable only once Israel has entered the promised land: a relativization which is perhaps reinforced by "the Law of the Prophet" in Deut 18:9-22.

As for the issue of ethical versus ritual law in the rest of the Old Testament, a number of passages express the priority of ethical law over ritual law. Many of these passages imply only the priority of what the law mandates over the voluntary offerings it merely permits and encourages,<sup>1</sup> but others suggest the priority of ethical law in more general terms, by suggesting the temporal relativity of the details governing the sanctuary ritual (Isa 66:3), or by anticipating the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood (Ps 110:1, 4) or of the sacrificial system (Ps 40:6-8; Jer 31:33, 34; Dan 9:27).

A number of prophetic passages suggest interruptions to the observance of various sacred times, but many of these passages have the sacrifices associated

---

16), but never to both at once.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., 1 Sam 15:22; Ps 69:30, 31 (vss. 31, 32, Hebrew); Prov 21:3; 15:18; Eccl 5:1 (4:17, Hebrew); Jer 6:19, 20; 7:21-23; 11:14, 15; Hos 6:6; Mic 6:6-8. Compare how Ps 50 contrasts sacrifices offered to manipulate the Deity with genuine thanksgiving offerings.

with them in view, rather than the times per se.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, they do imply the priority of ethical law over ritual law in general. Isa 1:10-17; Amos 5:21-27; and Mal 2:1-9 explicitly condemn the hypocrisy of simultaneously observing ritual law and disregarding ethical law. Amos 5:21-27 also affirms the historical relativity of those laws that do not apply throughout the wilderness period.

On the issue of the sacred times in particular, five possible criteria have been developed in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary. The first criterion concerns the canonical picture of whether or not a sacred time has a specific terminus ad quem. The second criterion concerns the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding its terminus a quo, and stresses the universalism of creation ordinances, in contrast to the particularism of sacred times established to commemorate events in Israel's history. It also emphasizes that institutions pictured as existing before the Fall presumably remain part of the divine ideal for humanity, unless explicitly stated otherwise. The third criterion looks for indications of how non-Israelites are to relate to the observance of a sacred time, since a sacred time that an uncircumcised

---

<sup>1</sup>Hos 2:8-13 (vss. 10-15, Hebrew); Isa 1:10-17; Lam 1:4; 2:6, 7; Joel 1:9, 13, 16; Mal 2:1-9.

alien is required to keep is presumably of more universal significance than a sacred time he is simply permitted to keep, and certainly of more universal significance than a sacred time he is prohibited from observing. The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time, and is based on two lines of reasoning: first, that a sacred time which is to be observed only under particular geographic circumstances is of more limited significance than one which is to be observed everywhere; and second, that a sacred time which presupposes the continued operation of the sanctuary and the sacrificial cultus is of more limited significance than one which does not. The fifth criterion concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times and is based on the argument that if the observance of a given sacred time is dependent upon the applicability of another sacred time, then when the second sacred time no longer applies, the dependent sacred time will also no longer apply. A summary can now be made of the evidence outside the Pentateuch in terms of these five possible criteria.

The first criterion concerns the canonical picture of the terminus ad quem of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the words עולם ("perpetuity") and דורות ("generations") are frequently used chronologically in

commands to observe the various sacred times,<sup>1</sup> and this use has been cited as evidence of their perpetuity. However, these terms emphasize the incalculability of the time period during which the sacred times are to apply, rather than a lack of a terminus ad quem per se. Four passages in the Prophets predict a prominent place for one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory: Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19. It is obvious that these passages have never been literally fulfilled in the past, and accordingly they have sometimes been interpreted as evidence of the perpetuity of the sacred times. However, this argument neglects the original context in which the predictions are given and ignores the element of conditionality attached to the fulfillment of many of their details. Conversely, it has been argued that the omissions and additions to the listing of feasts in Ezek 45:17-46:15 may be intended "to intimate that the ceremonial was not a finality and forever unalterable."<sup>2</sup> However, it is clear that omission here cannot necessarily be equated with abolition. The first criterion is thus the equivalent of the mathematical null set, ultimately proving

---

<sup>1</sup>For examples of this use of the word עולם, see Exod 12:14, 17, 24; 31:16, 17; Lev 16: 29, 31, 34; 23:14, 21, 41; 24:8). For examples of this use of the word דורות, see Exod 12: 14, 17, 42; 30:10; 31:13, 16; Lev 23:14, 21, 31, 41.

<sup>2</sup>Green, 237.



fruitless as an Old Testament indicator of the extent of the applicability of any Pentateuchal sacred time.

The second criterion concerns the canonical picture of the circumstances surrounding the terminus a quo of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the Sabbath is pictured as a creation ordinance (Gen 2:1-3; Exod 20:11; 31:17). On the other hand, the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread are presented as being specifically instituted to memorialize the Exodus,<sup>1</sup> and the Feast of Booths is pictured as being introduced to commemorate the wilderness experience of the Israelites (Lev 23:42, 43). Accordingly, a prima facie case exists that the Sabbath is permanent but that the Passover, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Feast of Booths are temporary. Outside the Pentateuch, the Old Testament contains no evidence subject to this criterion.

The third criterion concerns the identity of those who observe a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, one of the reasons for Sabbath observance is to enable the uncircumcised alien and other dependent groups to rest (Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14, 15), and the Sabbath remains in force when the practice of circumcision is suspended in the wilderness (cf. Josh 5:1-10; Ezek 20:11-16). In Isa 56:6, 7, there is no attempt to place the foreigner who

---

<sup>1</sup>Exod 12:14, 17, 42; 13:3; 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:1, 3.

allies himself with Yahweh under the obligation to observe the whole Mosaic Law. Instead, the religious ideal held up for Gentiles consists of just three things: "pure monotheism, moral life, and the Sabbath."<sup>1</sup> It is also predicted that "all flesh" will observe the New Moon and the Sabbath in Isa 66:22, 23.

As for the annual sacred times, the uncircumcised alien is specifically barred from observing the Passover (Exod 12:43-49), and it is implied that in the wilderness the Passover is suspended along with circumcision (Josh 5:1-10). The alien is prohibited from eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 12:19, but contextually the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view. The uncircumcised alien is permitted and encouraged to observe the Festival/Feast of Harvest/Weeks (Deut 16:11, 12; 26:11), but is not required to do so (Deut 16:16). The same situation applies to alien observance of the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Lev 22:42, 43; Deut 16:14, 16,). Zech 14:16-19 predicts that one day the defeated nations will observe the Feast of Booths. However, in contrast to the emphasis on universal equality in Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23, this case constitutes an example of universal imperium rather than universal equality, and there is no indication that it would still be observed in a setting where the ethnic, geographic, and nationalistic

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," 102.

elements of the prophecy no longer literally apply. The alien is required both to humble himself and to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29), but once again the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view.

In the Sabbatical Year, provision is made for the sustenance of the uncircumcised alien while the land lies fallow (Lev 25:6), and the uncircumcised alien attending the Feast of Booths is included in the comprehensive list of people who are to listen to the reading of the law (Deut 31:11, 12). Especially in the case of the sustenance of the alien, the reason may be to ensure the survival of the landless during the fallow year. However, his debts are not remitted in the Sabbatical Year as the Israelite's are, nor is the non-Israelite slave to be released after seven years, as the Israelite is (Exod 21:2; Deut 15:1-18). Likewise, in the Year of Jubilee, Israelite servants are to be released, whereas the slaves who are foreigners or the children of aliens may remain enslaved and be passed on from generation to generation (Lev 25:47-54).

The fourth criterion concerns the constituent elements necessary for the observance of a sacred time. In terms of this criterion, the relationship between a sacred time and the sacrificial cultus is of special interest, as is the nature of the geographical indicators associated with it.

On the issue of the sacred times and the sacrificial cultus, special sacrifices are certainly prescribed for the Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9; Num 28:9, 10). However, the Sabbath itself is presented as an institution that stands independent of the sanctuary cult (Exod 16:1, 2; 31:14, 15; Lev 23:2, 3). On the other hand, the obligation to observe the New Moon festival is presented solely in terms of the cult (Num 10:10; 28:11-15). Likewise, in Lev 23:37, the reason for the proclamation of the annual **מועדי יהוה** ("festivals of Yahweh") as **מקראי קדש** ("holy times") is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice, and the obligation to observe these **מקראי קדש** as rest days would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. Passover is pictured as dependent on the continued operation of the sacrificial system in Num 9:6, 7, 13, as is the Festival of the Wavesheaf in Lev 23:14, and the Day of Atonement is portrayed as dependent upon the continued operation of the tripartite sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of the **חג** or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system.

On the issue of the sacred times and geographic indicators, the Sabbath is pictured as a temple in time

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lev 16:1-28, 30-34; 23:28; 2 Kgs 8:65, 66; 2 Chr 7:9, 10; Ezra 3:1-6.

applicable both in the wilderness and in the promised land.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the temporary nature of three festivals is suggested by the fact that as agricultural festivals they became applicable only after Israel had entered the land: the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:10-14), the Feast of the Harvest/Weeks (Lev 23:22; Deut 26:1-11), and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Lev 23:40; Deut 16:12-15). Likewise, the Sabbatical Year presupposes the possession and division of the land,<sup>2</sup> and the Jubilee presupposes a system of ancestral land tenure (Lev 25:8-17, 23-34, 41; 27:16-24; Num 36:1-9). Three passages call for the centralized observance of Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Harvest/Weeks, and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (Exod 23:17; 34:23; Deut 16:1-16). However, the flexibility over the issue of centralization in the Pentateuch itself suggests that centralization cannot be assumed to be a necessary prerequisite for their observance (Lev 17:4; Deut 12:10, 11, 15). The Egyptian Passover in Exod 12 is observed without a central shrine, but this aspect of the first Passover may not be meant as a model for future Passover observance. On the other hand, space is emphasized above time in the provision of Num 9:9-14 for Israelites on a distant journey to celebrate

---

<sup>1</sup>Gen 2:1-3; Exod 16:1, 2; 31:14, 15; Num 15:32-36; Isa 56:6, 7; Ezek 20:11-16.

<sup>2</sup>Exod 23:10, 11; Lev 25:3; 26:24, 25, 43; 2 Chr 36:20, 21.

Passover a month later than normal. Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of the  $\mathfrak{M}$  or "pilgrim feast" on the possession of either the land or the sanctuary.

The fifth criterion concerns the interrelationship between the different sacred times. In terms of this criterion, the Feast of Unleavened Bread is an extension of the Passover (Deut 16:3), just as the Feast of Harvest/Weeks is an extension of the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:15). The Festival of Trumpets is a preparation for the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Ingathering/Booths (vss. 23-25; Ps 81:3 [vs. 4, Hebrew]), and the Jubilee presupposes the observance of the cycle of Sabbatical Years (Lev 25:8, 9). Likewise, it is proclaimed by the blowing of a trumpet on the Day of Atonement (vs. 9), so that at least this feature of the Year of Jubilee presupposes the continued observance of the Day of Atonement.

The evidence of the five criteria may now be analyzed in terms of each one of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

There is abundant evidence for the permanence of the Sabbath. In terms of the second criterion, it is pictured as a creation ordinance (Gen 2:1-3; Exod 20:11; 31:17). In terms of the third criterion, one of the reasons for Sabbath observance is to enable the uncircumcised alien and other dependent groups to rest

(Exod 20:10; 23:12; Deut 5:14, 15), and the Sabbath remains in force when the practice of circumcision is suspended in the wilderness (cf. Josh 5:1-10; Ezek 20:11-16). In Isa 56:6, 7, there is no attempt to place the foreigner who allies himself with Yahweh under the obligation to observe the whole Mosaic Law. Instead, the religious ideal held up for Gentiles consists of just three things: "pure monotheism, moral life, and the Sabbath."<sup>1</sup> It is also predicted that "all flesh" will observe the Sabbath in Isa 66:22, 23. In terms of the fourth criterion, special sacrifices are certainly prescribed for the Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9; Num 28:9, 10). However, the Sabbath itself is presented as an institution that stands independent of the sanctuary cult (Exod 16:1, 2; 31:14, 15; Lev 23:2, 3). Likewise, it is pictured as a temple in time applicable both in the wilderness and in the promised land.<sup>2</sup>

Evidence of the extent of the applicability of the New Moon is scanty, but such as there is suggests that it is only temporary in nature. In terms of the third criterion, it is true that Isa 66:22, 23 predicts that "all flesh" will observe it. However, in terms of the fourth criterion, the need to observe the New Moon festival is

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath," 102.

<sup>2</sup>Gen 2:1-3; Exod 16:1, 2; 31:14, 15; Num 15:32-36; Isa 56:6, 7; Ezek 20:11-16.

presented solely in terms of the sacrificial cult (Num 10:10; 28:11-15).

There is clear evidence of the temporary nature of Passover, the Festival/Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Festival of the Wavesheaf, and the Festival/Feast of Harvest/Weeks.

As for Passover, it is presented in terms of the second criterion as being specifically instituted to memorialize the Exodus (Exod 12:42; Deut 16:1). In terms of the third criterion, the uncircumcised alien is specifically barred from observing it (Exod 12:43-49), and it is implied that in the wilderness the Passover is suspended along with circumcision (Josh 5:1-10). In terms of the fourth criterion, Passover is clearly pictured as being dependent on the continued operation of the sacrificial system (Num 9:6, 7, 13), and space is emphasized above time in the provision of vss. 9-14 for Israelites on a distant journey to celebrate Passover a month later than normal. In a general way, Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of any  $\text{JN}$  or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system, and on the possession of either land or temple.

As for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, it is presented in terms of the second criterion as being



specifically instituted to memorialize the Exodus.<sup>1</sup> In terms of the third criterion, it is true that the alien is prohibited from eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:19). However, contextually the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view. In terms of the fourth criterion, the reason for the proclamation of *מקראי קדש* ("holy times") during the annual festivals is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice (Lev 23:37), so that the obligation to abstain from servile work on the first and seventh days of the Feast would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. As with Passover, Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of any *חג* or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system, and on the possession of either land or temple. In terms of the fifth criterion, the Feast of Unleavened Bread is an extension of the Passover (Deut 16:3), so that the obligation to observe would not be expected to continue in the absence of the obligation to observe Passover.

The fourth criterion is especially relevant to the Festival of the Wavesheaf. In terms of this criterion, its dependence on the continued operation of the sacrificial system is specifically indicated by Lev 23:14, and its

---

<sup>1</sup>Exod 12:14, 17; 13:3; 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:3.

applicability only after Israel has entered the promised land is indicated by its agricultural nature (vss. 10-14).

As for the Feast of Weeks, in terms of the third criterion it should be noted that the uncircumcised alien is permitted and encouraged to observe the Feast of Weeks (Deut 16:11, 12; 26:11), but is not required to do so (Deut 16:16). In terms of the fourth criterion, since the reason for the proclamation of *מקראי קדש* ("holy times") during the annual festivals is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice (Lev 23:37), the obligation to abstain from servile work would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. As with Passover and the Feast/Festival of Unleavened Bread, Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of any *מזל* or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system, and on the possession of either land or temple. As with the Festival of the Wavesheaf, the applicability of the Feast/ Festival of Harvest/Weeks only after Israel has entered the promised land is indicated by its agricultural nature (Lev 23:22; Deut 26:1-11). In terms of the fifth criterion, the Feast of Harvest/Weeks is an extension of the Festival of the Wavesheaf (Lev 23:15), so that no obligation to observe it would be expected in the absence of the observance of the Festival of the Wavesheaf.

As with the New Moon, evidence of the extent of the applicability of the Festival of Trumpets is scanty, but

such as there is suggests that this festival is only temporary in nature. In terms of the fourth criterion, since the reason for the proclamation of **מקראי קדש** ("holy times") during the annual festivals is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice (Lev 23:37), the obligation to abstain from servile work on the Festival of Trumpets would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. In terms of the fifth criterion, it is clearly a preparation for the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Booths (Lev 23:23-25; Ps 81:3 [vs. 4, Hebrew]), so that the obligation to observe it would not be expected to continue in the absence of both of these other two festivals.

There is clear evidence of the temporary nature of the Day of Atonement, the Festival/Feast of Ingathering/Booths, the Sabbatical Year/Year of Release, and the Jubilee.

As for the Day of Atonement, it is true that on this day the alien is required both to humble himself and to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29). At first sight, these requirements would seem to support the universal nature of the institution in terms of the third criterion. However, contextually the circumcised rather than the uncircumcised alien is in view. In terms of the fourth criterion, since the reason for the proclamation of **מקראי קדש** ("holy times") during the annual

festivals is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice (Lev 23:37), the obligation to abstain from work on the Day of Atonement would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. The Day of Atonement is also specifically portrayed as dependent upon the continued operation of the tripartite sanctuary.<sup>1</sup>

As for the Feast of Booths, it is pictured in terms of the second criterion as being introduced to commemorate the wilderness experience of the Israelites (Lev 23:42, 43). In terms of the third criterion, the uncircumcised alien is permitted and encouraged to observe it but is not required to do so (Lev 22:42, 43; Deut 16:14, 16,). It is true that it is predicted that the defeated nations will observe the Feast of Booths in Zech 14:16-19. However, in contrast to the prediction about the Sabbath and the New Moon in Isa 66:22, 23, this prediction is an example of universal imperium rather than universal equality, and there is no indication that it would still be observed in a setting where the ethnic, geographic, and nationalistic elements of the prophecy no longer literally apply. In terms of the fourth criterion, since the reason for the proclamation of **מקראי קדש** ("holy times") during the annual festivals is to mark off the boundaries of special periods of sacrifice (Lev 23:37), the obligation to abstain from

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lev 16:1-28, 30-34; 23:28; 2 Kgs 8:65, 66; 2 Chr 7:9, 10; Ezra 3:1-6.

servile work on the first and eighth days of this feast would not be expected to continue in the absence of the cultus. As with Passover, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Feast of Weeks, Hos 9:1-6 illustrates the dependence of any *ḥag* or "pilgrim feast" on the continued operation of the sacrificial system, and on the possession of either land or temple. As with the Festival of the Wavesheaf and the Feast or Festival of Harvest/Weeks, the applicability of this Feast only after Israel has entered the promised land is indicated by its agricultural nature (Lev 23:40; Deut 16:12-15).

As for the Sabbatical Year, in terms of the third criterion provision is made for the sustenance of the uncircumcised alien while the land lies fallow (Lev 25:6), and the uncircumcised alien attending the Feast of Booths is included in the comprehensive list of people who are to listen to the reading of the law (Deut 31:11, 12). However, his debts are not remitted in the Sabbatical Year as the Israelite's are, nor is the non-Israelite slave to be released after seven years, as the Israelite is (Exod 21:2; Deut 15:1-18). In terms of the fourth criterion, the Sabbatical Year presupposes the possession and division of the land,<sup>1</sup> and the limitations in terms of the third criterion would suggest that it is not meant to be a model

---

<sup>1</sup>Exod 23:10, 11; Lev 25:3; 26:24, 25, 43; 2 Chr 36:20, 21.

for the whole world, but is specifically applicable to the promised land.

As for the Jubilee, Israelite servants are to be released at this time, whereas the slaves who are foreigners or the children of aliens may remain enslaved and be passed on from generation to generation (Lev 25:47-54). This contrast constitutes a limitation in terms of the third criterion. In terms of the fourth criterion, the Jubilee presupposes a system of ancestral land tenure (Lev 25:8-17, 23-34, 41; 27:16-24; Num 36:1-9), and the limitations in terms of the third criterion would suggest that as with the Sabbatical Year, it is not meant to be a model for the whole world, but is specifically applicable to the promised land. In terms of the fifth criterion, the Jubilee presupposes the observance of the cycle of Sabbatical Years (Lev 23:8, 9), so that the obligation to observe it would also not be expected to continue in the absence of the Sabbatical Years. Likewise, it is proclaimed by the blowing of a trumpet on the Day of Atonement, so that at least this feature of the Jubilee presupposes the continued observance of the Day of Atonement (Lev 23:9).

Clearly, the five criteria used in this dissertation collectively support the thesis that the Sabbath itself is permanent, irrespective of the temporary nature of the sacrificial prescriptions and the judicial

sanctions associated with it. On the other hand, the Pentateuchal sacred times each have limitations attached to them suggesting that they are temporary institutions.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, this dissertation confirms that even if it is inappropriate to speak of three clear-cut literary divisions between moral, ceremonial, and judicial corpora, the Old Testament itself does distinguish between permanent and temporary aspects of the law, at least in the case of the Pentateuchal sacred times.

As noted in the introduction, the issue of Old Testament laws and the internal indicators of the extent of their applicability is directly related to the question of whether the law is a point of continuity or discontinuity between the Testaments—a question that in turn may have important implications for Jewish-Christian dialogue, as well as for biblical theology in general and Old Testament theology in particular.

---

<sup>1</sup>See table 1 summarizing the relationship between each of the Pentateuchal sacred times and the second to fifth criteria used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary. The Sabbath is the only sacred time that does not have a limitation attached to it in terms of any of these four criteria. The New Moon has no limitation in terms of the third criterion, but does have one in terms of the fourth criterion. Each of the other Pentateuchal sacred times has a limitation in one or more of the criteria, and no clear evidence of a lack of limitation in terms of any other criterion.

The first criterion does not appear on this table because it is the equivalent of the mathematical null set as an Old Testament indicator of the extent of the applicability of any Pentateuchal sacred time.

Table 1.—Summary of findings

Sacred Time	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5
Sabbath	<b>Gen 2:1-3</b> <b>Exod 20:11</b> <b>Exod 31:17</b>	<b>Exod 20:10</b> <b>Exod 23:12</b> <b>Deut 5:14, 15</b> <b>Ezek 20:11-16</b> <b>Isa 56:6, 7</b> <b>Isa 66:22, 23</b>	<b>Gen 2:1-3</b> <b>Exod 16:1, 2</b> <b>Exod 31:14, 15</b> <b>Lev 23:2, 3</b> <b>Num 15:32-36</b> <b>Isa 56:6, 7</b> <b>Ezek 20:11-16</b>	
New Moon		<b>Isa 66:22, 23</b>	Num 10:10 Num 28:11-15	
Passover	Exod 12:42 Deut 16:1	Exod 12:43-49 Josh 5:1-10	Num 9:6-14 Hos 9:1-6	
Feast of Unleavened Bread	Exod 12:14, 17 Exod 13:3 Exod 23:15 Exod 34:18 Deut 16:3		Lev 23:37 Hos 9:1-6	Deut 16:3
Festival of the Wavesheaf			Lev 23:10-14	
Feast of Weeks		Deut 16:11, 12, 16 Deut 26:11	Lev 23:22, 37 Hos 9:1-6	Lev 23:15
Festival of Trumpets			Lev 23:37	Lev 23:23-25 Ps 81:3
Day of Atonement			Lev 16:1-34 Lev 23:28, 37 2 Kgs 8:65, 66 2 Chr 7:9, 10 Ezra 3:1-6	
Feast of Booths	Lev 23:42, 43	Lev 23:42, 43 Deut 16:14, 16	Lev 23:37, 40 Deut 16:12-15 Hos 9:1-6	
Sabbatical Year		Exod 21:2 Deut 15:1-18	Exod 23:10, 11 Lev 25:3 Lev 26:24, 25, 43 2 Chr 36:20, 21	
Jubilee		Lev 25:47-34	Lev 25:8-17, 23-54 Lev 27:16-24 Num 36:1-9	Lev 23:8-9

Note: Texts in bold contain evidence of the absence of limitation; those not in bold contain evidence of its presence.



It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to undertake a detailed study of the New Testament's teachings about the extent of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times. However, the New Testament emphasizes the priority of original creation orders (e.g., Matt 19:3-7) and applies the prophecy of Deut 18:15-18 to Christ (Act 3:22-23). It presents his death as the supreme sacrifice superseding all the sacrifices prescribed by the law (e.g., Heb 10:4-10 on Ps 40:6-8) through which the dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles is abrogated (e.g., Eph 2:11-18). It pictures him as the priest-king of Ps 110 (Heb 7) through whom the believer now has direct access into the presence of God (e.g., Heb 4:16). Finally, its focus is ultimately on Jerusalem above more than on Jerusalem below (e.g., Gal 4:25, 26; Heb 12:22; Rev 21:1-8).

In view of these emphases and of the findings of this dissertation, a biblical theology emphasizing continuity between the Testaments should assume the continuation of the Sabbath in the Christian era, unless the New Testament itself explicitly indicates otherwise. On the other hand, in the case of the other Pentateuchal sacred times, the burden of proof should be reversed. In other words, such a biblical theology should assume the abrogation of these sacred times, unless the New Testament itself specifically reenacts them.

From the Christian perspective, the findings of this study have immediate implications for the interpretation of Col 2:16, 17, where a conclusion is drawn from the picture of Christ and his work presented in vs. 9-15:

**Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων· ἃ ἔστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.**

Let no one therefore judge you about eating or drinking or concerning a festival or New Moon or Sabbath, which are shadows of things to come, but the body [is] of Christ.

In the Old Testament, the sequence of festival, New Moon, and Sabbath clearly includes the weekly Sabbath, as does the reverse sequence of Sabbath, New Moon, and festival.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the weekly Sabbath is presumably also included in Col 2:16. On the other hand, it has been argued that this fact does not necessarily imply the rejection of all Sabbatarianism, because when these terms are used sequentially in the Old Testament, the sacrificial offerings are particularly in view, rather than the days themselves.<sup>2</sup> This argument has some validity, for while the Old Testament prescribes special offerings for the Sabbath, it does not picture it as being dependent upon them for its continued applicability.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup>Giem, 206-208.

The distinction between the sacrificial offerings prescribed for a holy day and the sanctity of the day itself has been used to argue for the continued Christian observance of the annual holy days.<sup>1</sup> However, this position is untenable, since the Old Testament pictures the observance of the New Moon and all the annual Pentateuchal sacred times as being dependent upon the continued operation of the sacrificial system.<sup>2</sup>

Judaism has been divided over the question of the applicability of the Pentateuchal sacred times to Gentiles, just as Christianity has been. This has been especially true with respect to the Sabbath, and the findings of this dissertation are equally applicable to the Jewish and the Christian debates.

In terms of Jewish-Christian dialogue, it has been claimed that "the fundamental meaning of the Jewish No [to Jesus Christ] . . . was from the beginning and continues to be an act of fidelity to Torah and Torah's God."<sup>3</sup> This dissertation has proposed one way in which Christians might emulate the Jews' faithfulness to Torah and still say "Yes" to Jesus Christ. Jews might then discover a way to emulate the Christians' "Yes" to Jesus Christ and still remain faithful to Torah. In particular, the Sabbath is a central

---

<sup>1</sup>God's Festivals and Holy Days, 9.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 341.

<sup>3</sup>van Buren, 34.

issue in the historical schism between Judaism and Christianity,<sup>1</sup> and the findings of this dissertation suggest that Christians must seriously consider what they might learn from Jewish Sabbath-keeping.<sup>2</sup>

As for the other Pentateuchal sacred times, Jewish sources have not generally envisaged an explicit terminus ad quem for them, any more than for the Sabbath. However, as shown in the review of Jewish sources, in practice Judaism has often recognized that there may be no Old Testament authority for the continued observance of certain aspects of the Pentateuchal sacred times, especially in view of the destruction of the temple and of the end of the

---

<sup>1</sup>"The change from Saturday to Sunday as the day of worship . . . made a choice between the two imperatives. It is understandable, in the light of the change, that conversion to Christianity could appear to Jews as a denial of Judaism. This was a matter of conscience the importance of which I would not minimize." Cardinal Danielou, as quoted by Doukhan, Sources, 23, italics and ellipsis Doukhan's.

<sup>2</sup>"However controversial and far from the ideal sabbath observance may be in the State of Israel, the situation contrasts very favorably with the decline of observance of the Lord's day in so-called Christian lands. In the State of Israel, the Christian confronts a whole nexus of sabbath practices which brings to life the biblical teaching that the natural order of creation is one realm where God meets us, if only fragmentarily. . . . Materialism and secular humanism are two of the most serious challenges to Christian belief and practice today. In the State of Israel, as nowhere else, the celebration of God's creating and resting has a significance which for all its difficulties, is a needed corrective to an important failure of nerve in Christian theology." Paul R. Dekar, "Does the State of Israel Have Theological Significance?" Theodolite: A Journal of Christian Thought and Practice 7/1 (1983); reprinted in The Conrad Grebel Review 2 (1984): 45, 46.

sacrificial system. The New Moon festival today has scarcely any liturgical impact, and modern Jews do not observe the Sabbatical Year or the Jubilee. Passover observance has continued, but it remains an open question as to whether the obligation to eat matzah (unleavened bread) now rests on biblical or rabbinic authority. As for the Festival of the Wavesheaf, debate remains as to whether the grain crop is lifted by the day itself, or by the ritual prescribed for it. Likewise, it is probably because of the destruction of the temple that the expression "Day of Atonement" has been read as a genitive of effect ("the day that atones") rather than a temporal genitive ("the day when atonement is made").

Clearly, it is too simplistic to present Judaism as adhering strictly to Old Testament teaching concerning the Pentateuchal sacred times, and Christianity as largely abandoning it, for in practice Judaism itself has adapted its understanding of their observance, although less dramatically than Christianity generally has. Indeed, Lohfink suggests that, in practice, oral law and rabbinic exegesis have served the same adaptive function in Judaism as has the distinction between the Decalogue and ceremonial law in Christianity.<sup>1</sup> If this claim is even partly true, this dissertation may be a springboard for dialogue about

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohfink, "Kennt das Alte Testament einen Unterschied?" 87.

the different ways that Judaism and Christianity have come to understand the Pentateuchal sacred times, the reasons for their different approaches, and the possible bases these divergences may have in the Old Testament itself.

An important area for further investigation is the question of the developments in the intertestamental understanding of the Pentateuchal sacred times and the way that these developments might have impacted Jewish and Christian understandings of the extent of their applicability. There is also a need to investigate Old Testament indicators of the extent of the applicability of other Old Testament laws, and to study the methodology the New Testament uses for discerning their ongoing relevance. The way might then be prepared for a truly biblical theology of Old Testament laws and internal indicators of the extent of their applicability, and for a truly informed Jewish-Christian dialogue on the meaning of law.

## APPENDIX

### CONDITIONALITY, COVENANT, AND CLASSICAL PROPHECY

Four prophetic passages predict a prominent place for one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory: Isa 56:1-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19. It is obvious that these passages have never been literally fulfilled in the past, and accordingly some interpreters who take the authority of Scripture seriously have seen such passages as direct indicators of the continued applicability of these sacred times now and/or in the future.<sup>1</sup> In other words, they have

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, God's Festivals and Holy Days, 33, 34, 43, uses Zech 14:16 as evidence of the continued present applicability of the Feast of Booths, and SDABC, 1:802, cites Isa 66:22, 23, as evidence that the Sabbath "will remain after sin is no more." Dispensationalists do not accept the present applicability of any of the Pentateuchal sacred times. However, they generally accept that these texts do point to the applicability of those named in these passages during the Millennium. E.g., see Merrill F. Unger, Zechariah: Prophet of Messiah's Glory (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1963), 264-269; Charles Lee Feinberg, The Prophecy of Ezekiel: The Glory of the Lord (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1969), 267-275; and Griffith, 229-257. Notice also how Ralph H. Alexander poses the question, "Is Ezekiel 40-48 historical or literal?," as if there could be no third option. Ralph H. Alexander, "Ezekiel," EBC, ed. Frank E. Gaebeline, Regency Reference Library (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1986), 6:943. See also Stephen D. Ricks, "The Prophetic Literality of Tribal Reconstruction," in Israel's Apostasy

cited these passages as evidence of the permanence of one or more of the sacred times in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem.

A major problem with this approach is that it neglects the focus of such predictions on the postexilic period.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, there is a need to examine other approaches to the meaning of these predictions.

A second approach is characteristic of the "covenant theology" of the Reformed tradition, and applies such Old Testament predictions directly to the church and to the eternal state, figuratively rather than literally.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the predicted future observance of sacred times in the Prophets is interpreted as a metaphor for regularity of worship, rather than as an indicator of their

---

and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 273-281.

<sup>1</sup>LaRondelle, 17, 119, 120. A parallel example of such neglect is the interpretation of Hos 2:13 offered by Griffith, 141, 142, which fails to explain the immediate relevance of this verse to the situation of Hosea and his readers, nor how it relates to the withdrawal of agricultural produce and the stopping of Baal worship, as depicted in Hos 2:6-13. See above, p. 281, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., O. T. Allis, Prophecy and the Church: An Examination of the Claim of Dispensationalists that the Christian Church is a Mystery Parenthesis which Interrupts the Fulfilment to Israel of the Kingdom Prophecies of the Old Testament (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1945); Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 18-21.



continued applicability.<sup>1</sup> This approach is correct in rejecting a wooden literalism, for the future can be depicted proleptically only in terms of the often limited categories of the past and the present,<sup>2</sup> and due consideration must be given to the use of figures of speech.<sup>3</sup> However, the danger is that once again the original context of the Old Testament predictions will be neglected, as a priori presuppositions about the role of the church and the nature of the eternal state become the rubrics for determining how prophetic figures should be interpreted, instead of the text itself.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Leupold, 273-275; E. J. Young, The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes, vol. 3, Chapters 40 through 66 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1972), 536; Patrick Fairbairn, An Exposition of Ezekiel (Reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1960), 441, 442.

<sup>2</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Back Toward the Future: Hints for Interpreting Biblical Prophecy (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), 51.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 41.

<sup>4</sup>For example, Baldwin sees these eschatological prophecies as encompassing the Christian Age from the time they were first made. Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 18. However, she is left with little basis for her assertion, when she goes on to concede that "the prophets themselves could hardly be expected to appreciate" how their predictions concerning the temple in fact symbolized Christ and the church. Ibid., 21. "It is overstating the case to refer Ezekiel's vision directly to a Christian 'fulfilment', without seeing that it has a real context for the readers of his own day, and this original context must be the prime concern of the Old Testament exegete." Taylor, 252.

The approach to classical prophecy proposed here is to begin with a literal exegesis of the Old Testament predictions, but also to attempt to distinguish between conditional and unconditional elements of the prophecies.<sup>1</sup> The Old Testament frequently presents the divine purpose as immutable.<sup>2</sup> However, there are also a number of passages where conditionality is explicitly stated,<sup>3</sup> and many more where it is clearly present, although not overtly expressed.<sup>4</sup> "Thus hundreds of prophecies that appear to be

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the approach advocated by "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy," SDABC, ed. F. D. Nichol (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Pub. Assn., 1955; rev. ed., 1977), 4:25-38; William G. Johnsson, "Conditionality in Biblical Prophecy with Particular Reference to Apocalyptic," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, DARCOM, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 259-265; Richard M. Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology," in Symposium on Revelation: Introductory and Exegetical Studies, Book 1, DARCOM, vol. 6, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 108, n. 16.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., in Ps 33:11; Prov 19:21; Isa 46:10. For more information, see "The Role of Israel in Bible Prophecy," 34.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Lev 26; Deut 28; Isa 1:19, 20; Jer 3:12; 17:24-27; 26:12, 13; 38:17, 18; 42:10-16; Hos 11:8. See Kaiser, Back toward the Future, 61-65; Harrison, Jeremiah, 107.

<sup>4</sup>Turner has studied the relationships between the "Announcements of plot" in Gen 1:28; 12:1-3; 25:23; 27:27-29, 39, 40; and 37:5-11, and the "four major narrative blocks which comprise the book [of Genesis] (i.e. the primaevial history and the stories of Abraham, Jacob, and Jacob's family)." Turner, 13. He notes that some elements of the Announcements are fulfilled only slowly, while others are modified or even negated. Ibid., 177. Accordingly, he concludes that these announcements are not immutable decrees, but are declarations of divine intention, whose fulfillment is at least partly contingent

absolute are actually conditional."<sup>1</sup> It is the covenantal context of classical prophecy that provides the ultimate clue as to how any particular element should be classified.

David Noel Freedman distinguishes between two kinds of Old Testament covenants: covenants of "divine commitment," such as the covenants with Noah, Abraham, and David, which focus on what God will do for human beings; and covenants of "human obligation," such as the covenant of Sinai, which focus on what human beings must do for God.<sup>2</sup> Since man is the fickle element of the divine-human

---

upon an appropriate human response. "Whether a divine Announcement governs its narrative or not depends to a large extent, not on Yahweh's forcing it through, or systematically overcoming all opposition, but on how humans behave." Ibid., 182.

Other Old Testament passages where conditionality is present but not explicitly stated include 1 Sam 2:30-36; 1 Kgs 21:19-29; 2 Kgs 20:1-6; 22:16-20; Jonah; Mic 3:12 compared with Jer 26:12-19. See Kaiser, Back toward the Future, 63-68; Roderick Campbell, Israel and the New Covenant (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1954), 201, 207. Even a divine oath can be reversed, according to Num 14:26-34. See G. H. Lang, "God's Covenants are Conditional," Evangelical Quarterly 30 (1958): 95. The principle governing such statements is spelled out for nations in Jer 18:7-10 and for individuals in Ezek 33:13-16. See Desmond Ford, The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1979), 98, n. 72.

<sup>1</sup>Kaiser, Back Toward the Future, 66.

<sup>2</sup>David Noel Freedman, "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation. The Covenant Theme," Int 18 (1964): 420, 421. The present tendency is to speak of "treaties" and "grants" instead of covenants of "divine commitment" and "human obligation." E.g., see McComiskey, 63; Bruce K. Waltke, "The Phenomenon of Conditionality within Unconditional Covenants," in Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 124. This tendency is

relationship, there might seem to be a prima facie case that the first type of covenant is unconditional and the

---

based on Weinfeld's distinction between two types of judicial documents in the ancient Near East: the "treaty" and the "royal grant." Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East," Journal of the American Oriental Society 90 (1970): 184, 185. According to Weinfeld, the treaty is "an inducement to future loyalty" in which the vassal is obligated to his master and "the curse is directed towards the vassal who will violate the rights of the king." Ibid., 185. On the other hand, the grant is "a reward for loyalty and good deeds already performed" in which the master is obligated toward the servant and "the curse is directed towards the one who will violate the rights of the king's vassal." Ibid. A rebellious descendant may forfeit his individual right to the grant, but it still remains an inalienable possession of his successors. Ibid., 189, 190.

Weinfeld himself identifies the covenants at Sinai and Moab with "treaty," and the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants with "grant." Ibid., 185-200. However, his language is avoided in this dissertation because the correspondence can be drawn only in the most general fashion, unless evidence is ignored from Ancient Near Eastern covenant types and from the Old Testament itself. The concept that disloyalty brings punishment but does not bring the revocation of the gift is not exclusive to grants, but is also found in treaties. In fact, royal succession is often guaranteed as a part of treaties, but never by a royal grant. Paul Kalluveettil, Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East, *Analecta biblica: Investigationes scientificae in res biblicas*, 88 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 180, n. 234. A strong case exists that the promise of Gen 12:1-3 inaugurates the covenantal relationship of God with Abraham, the "cutting" of the covenant in Gen 15:18 giving it only solidity and formal legal status. William J. Dumbrell, "The Covenant with Abraham," Reformed Theological Review 41 (1982): 42-50. It thus can hardly be a reward for good work, as Weinfeld insists. Nor is David's fidelity ever cited as a reason for the gift of dynasty. See Kalluveettil, 181. In the Abrahamic covenant there is only a promise of land. However, in the Ancient Near Eastern grant "the king is not simply promising the lands, but is issuing a decree of land transfer; the underling possesses the land from this moment. We confront two different juridical forms: land grant and land promise." Ibid., 180, n. 234.

second type is conditional. However, the fact is that there are clearly conditional and unconditional elements in each of the covenants just listed.

Conditional elements are evident in the covenants with Noah, Abraham, and David, despite their predominantly unconditional tone. In the covenant with Noah, "God's grant of seasonal harvest and blessing are in space and time universally irrevocable, but locally and temporarily conditional upon moral behavior or providential acts."<sup>1</sup> In the covenant with Abraham, "YHWH irrevocably committed himself to give Abraham an innumerable progeny and make him a father of many nations, to give him and his descendants the promised land forever, to be their God, and to bless others through them."<sup>2</sup> However, in Gen 18:19, "YHWH explains that his grant extends only to those within

---

<sup>1</sup>Waltke, "Conditionality," 127.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 130.

Abraham's household who behave ethically."<sup>1</sup> In the covenant with David,

the fate of individual kings or claimants was not guaranteed, but in the end the divine promise would be fulfilled. Historical contingency was balanced by theological certainty concerning the place of the house of David in the destiny of the nation.<sup>2</sup>

Unconditional elements are evident in the Sinai covenant, despite the conditional tone of Exod 19:6. For example, in Exod 19:3-6,

the separation of Israel from her broad cultural environment, her invitation to obey a covenant already existing, her call to be a light to lighten the Gentiles . . . all of this is confessedly Abrahamic in tenor. As the continuity of the Exodus narratives suggests (compare Exod 3:13-15; 6:1-8), the Sinai covenant was in fact a particularization of Gen. 12:1-3 in the experience of Israel. Like Abram, Israel was called outside of the land that would be hers. Like Abram, Israel would be a great nation (*gôy*), occupying

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 129, which points to Deut 29:10-13 as confirmation of this principle. For more information on conditional elements in the Abrahamic covenant, see Campbell, 161; McComiskey, 64-66; O. T. Allis, God Spake by Moses (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1951), 72; D. P. Fuller, Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?—The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1980), 134-145; Ronald Youngblood, "The Abrahamic Covenant: Conditional or Unconditional," in The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz, ed. Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 31-46; Gerhard F. Hasel, Covenant in Blood (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Pub. Assoc., 1982), 38-40; idem, "Israel in Bible Prophecy," JATS 3/1 (Spring 1992): 140-144.

<sup>2</sup>Freedman, 426. See also Campbell, 192; Waltke, "Conditionality," 130-132; Hasel, "Israel in Bible Prophecy," 144, 145; Avraham Gileadi, "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection," in Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 158, 159.

a "promised land." Like Abram, the world would find its source of blessing in this Israel.<sup>1</sup>

Certainly, the worship of the golden calf demonstrates that national Israel offers no prospect for unconditionality in the Sinai covenant.<sup>2</sup> However, the subsequent role of Moses does suggest a prospect for unconditionality:

God had raised up for himself a Moses from the debacle that was Israel on Sinai. In this Moses the covenant hopes would be fostered. But Moses was simply representative of a faithful Israel of that and future periods. God would continue to move upon the hearts of pious men and women in Israel through whom the reality of the concept of worshipping community, drawn together at Sinai, would endure. In brief, the prospect for the unconditionality of this national covenant lay not in the nation with whom it was made but in the remnant that would emerge from this nation.<sup>3</sup>

The new covenant promise of Jer 31:31-34 is of special interest to this study, for while the expression "new covenant" is found nowhere else in the Old Testament, the same idea is apparent in Ezekiel and Isa 40-66, which also anticipate the return from exile.<sup>4</sup> Here some interpreters have seen the ultimate resolution of the

---

<sup>1</sup>William J. Dumbrell, "The Prospect of Unconditionality in the Sinaitic Covenant," in Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 153.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 152.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 153. See also Campbell, 26; Gerhard F. Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah, AUM, Studies in Religion, vol. 5, 3d ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1980).

<sup>4</sup>Freedman, 430. For more information on Jer 31:31-34, see above, pp. 257-261.

tension between divine commitment and human obligation.<sup>1</sup> However, the fact is that Jeremiah's new covenant is partly unconditional and partly conditional, just like the other covenants examined here.<sup>2</sup> Jer 31:35-37 affirms that the salvation of a righteous remnant is as sure as the movements of the heavenly bodies and the roaring of the waves of the sea.<sup>3</sup> Jer 33:14-26 affirms that the rise of a righteous Davidic priest-king is as certain as the alternation of night and day.<sup>4</sup> However, individual

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., 431; Waltke, "Conditionality," 136.

<sup>2</sup>As one might expect if the designation of the covenant as "new" is ironic. See above, p. 259.

<sup>3</sup>See especially vs. 37, where Yahweh affirms that he will not reject "all the seed of Israel" (כל זרע ישראל). (The LXX omits any translation of the word כל ["all"] but the versions do not.) Likewise in vs. 7, the prayer ascends, "O Yahweh save your people, the remnant of Israel" (הושע יהוה את עמך את שארית ישראל), then in vss. 8-14 their return is described. It is the promise of the internalization of the law in vs. 33 and the promise of forgiveness of sins in vs. 34 that guarantee the righteousness of the remnant.

<sup>4</sup>This passage is absent from the LXX but there is no sound reason for questioning its authenticity. E.g., see Emanuel Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, no. 54 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters Leuven and Leuven University Press, 1981), 154.

Jer 33:15, 16 is essentially a repetition of the promise of Jer 23:5, 6 to raise up a sprout from David's line (לדור צמח צדיק). However, Jer 33:17, 18 adds the promise of a perpetual priesthood:

כִּי כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה לֹא־יִכָּרֵת לְדָוִד אִישׁ יֹשֵׁב עַל־כִּסֵּא בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל: וּלְכֹהֲנִים הָלָלִים לֹא־יִכָּרֵת אִישׁ מִלִּפְנֵי מַעְלָה עוֹלָה וּמִקְטֹרֶת מִנְחָה וְעֹשֶׂה זֶבַח כָּל־הַיָּמִים



participation in the new covenant remains conditional,<sup>1</sup> as

17 "For thus says Yahweh, 'David will not lack a man  
sitting upon the throne of the house of Israel  
18 "'and the priests and the Levites, will not lack a man  
before me, always offering burnt offering, sending  
grain-offering up in smoke, and making sacrifice.'"  
It has been claimed that Jer 33:18 affirms the perpetuity  
of a literal Levitical priesthood offering literal animal  
sacrifices. E.g., see John C. Whitcomb, "Christ's  
Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel," Grace  
theological Journal 6 (1985): 206. However, this claim  
ignores the significance of the symbolism of the verse, as  
expressed, for example, in the use of the word צמח  
("sprout") in vs. 15. Zech 6:9-15 uses the same word to  
designate a single individual encompassing the offices of  
both king and priest. See Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah,  
Malachi, 132-138; idem, "Short Notes," 95-97; Kaiser,  
Messiah, 214, 215. Accordingly, a strong intertextual  
basis exists for seeing a description of the work of the  
coming Messianic "sprout" of David in both Jer 33:17 and  
vs. 18. See Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 135. The  
apparent identification of the coming Davidic king as a  
priest in Jer 30:9, 21 provides further support for this  
position, as does the use of the singular אִישׁ in the context  
of both the Levites and David. For more information, see  
Kaiser, Messiah, 189-191.

<sup>1</sup>Feinberg, "Jeremiah," 576 claims that "Jeremiah  
stresses the nature of the covenant as a national, not an  
individual covenant." However, personal responsibility  
clearly comes to the fore in Jer 31:29, 30, where it is  
affirmed that in the days to come each person is to die for  
his own iniquity.

"In the text as it has reached us, the new covenant  
would be made with Israel and Judah, that is, with the  
whole people of Israel." Thompson, Jeremiah, 580.  
Accordingly, R. K. Harrison carries the case too far when  
he argues that "in acclaiming this new form of covenantal  
relationship. . . Jeremiah . . . saw that it changed the  
older concept of a corporate relationship completely by  
substituting the individual for the nation as a whole."  
R. K. Harrison, Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction  
and Commentary, TOTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press,  
1973), 140. Nevertheless, it "remains true" that within  
this covenant, "men were to make their individual choice of  
commitment to Yahweh." Thompson, Jeremiah, 579. Compare  
how the stress on divine initiative in Ezek 36:27-29  
balanced by the stress on individual responsibility in Ezek  
18.

does the timing of the promises attached to it.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The postexilic period is the setting Jer 31:31-34 anticipates for the fulfillment of the new covenant. See LaRondelle, 119, 120. However, Zech 1:2-6 stresses that the warnings given to the fathers by the former Prophets apply with equal force to the postexilic generation. Accordingly, in vs. 3 the realization of Yahweh's purpose for them is specifically made contingent upon their response to him: **וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי נָא** **יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְאָשׁוּב אֵלֵיכֶם** ("And say to them, 'Thus says Yahweh of hosts, "Turn to me," [is] the utterance of Yahweh of hosts, "so that I may return to you," says Yahweh of hosts"').

Zech 6:15 concludes the predictions concerning the **צֶמַח** or "sprout" starting in vs. 11 and particularly stresses the principle of conditionality. "The last part of v 15, 'And it shall be if you truly hearken to the voice of Yahweh your God,' appears to be an incomplete quotation of Deut 28:1. Deut 28 is the chapter that sets out the blessings and curses of the covenant. Zechariah or the redactor wanted to remind the reader that the promises of God's blessings are covenant promises. Faithfulness to the covenant was essential. . . . So the book of Zechariah opened with a call for the people to turn back to Yahweh (1:1-6). This part of the book closes with a reminder that the blessings (rebuilding the temple and the messianic age) are coming (**וְהָיָה**—and it will be), but that they are dependent on a proper response to the voice of Yahweh expressed in the covenant (cf. 8:8)." Smith, 219.

Like Zech 1:2-6, Zech 7:7-14 stresses the continued applicability of the warnings of the former Prophets to the postexilic situation, and the use of imperfects in vs. 13b and of a consecutive perfect in vs. 14a may even point to the possibility of future exile. Ibid., 227, 228.

The good things Yahweh promises to do for Jerusalem in Zech 8:2-15 are made contingent upon the ethical response of the people in vss. 16, 17. "The promise of blessing is assured because Yahweh has purposed it. However, the time and place of its fulfillment is conditioned by the people's response. Therefore Zechariah adds a statement about the moral and ethical responsibilities of the people very similar to the statement in the previous sermon (7:4-14, especially vv 9-10)." Smith, 237.

Earlier examples of Old Testament prophecies whose fulfillment is delayed are found in such passages as Num 14:26-34; 1 Kgs 21:19-29; 2 Kgs 22:19, 20; and Mic 3:12 compared with Jer 26:18, 19. See Kaiser, Back toward the Future, 65, 67, 68.

The fact that the timing of the fulfillment of some Old Testament predictions may be conditional is of particular interest, for in a delayed fulfillment, it cannot be assumed that details specific to the original setting will be completely or literally realized.<sup>1</sup> In terms of this dissertation, it has already been observed that the Old Testament itself contains hints of the ultimate abrogation of the sacrificial cultus.<sup>2</sup> It should also be noted that the Old Testament itself hints at the possibility of the righteous of all nations being a part of

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, in the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1-18) it is anticipated that the Philistines, the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Canaanites will all tremble at Israel's advance (vss. 14, 15). However, in the subsequent narrative, the king of Edom shows absolutely no fear of the Israelites and sends them into retreat (Num 20:14-21). This discrepancy has been cited by those who advocate a late date for Exod 15:14-16. E.g., Hyatt, 166. On the other hand, it is also readily explicable on the basis of Num 14:26-34 and its reversal of the divine oath to take the Exodus generation into the promised land: a reversal that may have encouraged the self-confidence of Israel's enemies. G. A. Chadwick, "The Book of Exodus," in Genesis-Exodus, EB, vol. 1 (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908), part 2, 217. In other words, the predictions of Exod 15:14-16 may be fulfilled in a general way. See Josh 2:10, 11, and Kaiser, "Exodus," 396. However, some of the details are conditional.

From a New Testament perspective, according to Rev 21:1-8 death is abolished in the new heaven and the new earth (see vs. 4). However, according to the parallel passage of Isa 65:17-25, death continues in the new heavens and new earth, albeit at a much later age than at present (see vs. 20).

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 334.

a new Israel,<sup>1</sup> and at the prospect of the whole heavens and

---

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, Gospel and Law, 124, notes that "the dispensationalist finds nothing in Genesis 12:3 . . . which indicates that the people from all nations who bless themselves in Abraham enjoy a status which would justify their designation as the 'seed of Abraham.'" However, he also notes the promise of Gen 17:4-8 that Abraham would father many nations, and argues persuasively that "'all the nations of the earth' who would bless themselves through Abraham and 'the multitude of nations' whom Abraham fathered, would be virtually the same group." Ibid., 130. In support of the spiritual interpretation of the promise, Beckwith, 109, rightly points out how "the promise that many nations and kings will spring from Abraham (Gn. 17:4-6) is to be fulfilled through Sarah (Gn. 17:16), thus excluding the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, and through Jacob (Gn. 35:11; 48:4), thus excluding the Edomites—and with them the external interpretation!" See also Fuller, Gospel and Law, 126. It has also been noted that Isa 19:24, 25 parallels Gen 12:3, but ranks Egypt and Assyria alongside Israel as mediators and blessers of the nations. See Duane L. Christensen, "A New Israel: The Righteous from among All Nations," in Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 252; Walter Vogels, W. F., God's Universal Covenant: A Biblical Study (Ottawa: Saint Paul University and University of Ottawa Press, 1979), 109.

Walter C. Kaiser notes that in harmony with the understanding of Acts 15:13-18, Amos 9:11, 12, is not about "David's or Israel's military subjugation of Edom and other Gentiles; rather it is about their spiritual incorporation into the restored kingdom of David." Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Davidic Promise and the Inclusion of the Gentiles (Amos 9:9-15 and Acts 15:13-18). A Test Passage for Theological Systems," JETS 20 (1977): 103. See also Hasel, The Remnant, 393; Fuller, Gospel and Law, 178. Likewise, a comparison of Job 42:16, 17, and the chronology of Genesis suggests that Job is a literary counterpart of Abraham, "a 'crypto-patriarch,' a model of righteousness comparable to and complimentary [*sic*; should be complementary] of Israel's ancestors." Christensen, 256. "That the home of Job and his friends is strongly associated with Edom thus takes on deeper meaning." Ibid., 257.

On the inclusion of uncircumcised foreigners among Yahweh's people in Isa 56:1-8, see above, pp. 303-306.

earth being encompassed in the promise of land.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, in a delayed fulfillment of prophecy, a literal fulfillment of the prophetic descriptions of the sacrificial cultus or of nationalism cannot be automatically expected,<sup>2</sup> nor can the literal application of ethnic and geographic designations and their associated ritual boundaries.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In Gen 13:14-16, "God's invitation to Abraham to look 'north and south, east and west' in the land of Canaan sets no limits." LaRondelle, 139. Isa 65:17 speaks "in cosmic terms. . . . Here the prophet unites heaven and earth together as one glorious inheritance for eschatological Israel." Ibid., 140. "As the writer to the Hebrews points out, the confession of the patriarchs that they are strangers and pilgrims (Gn. 23:4; 47:9) shows that they were not looking *simply* for an earthly land (Heb. 11:9f., 13-16). This is particularly plain when the statement is made with regard to the time after the entry of their descendants into Canaan (Lev. 25:23; 1 Ch. 29:15; Pss. 39:12; 119:19)." Beckwith, 108.

<sup>2</sup>From a New Testament perspective, Goulder, 349, 353 notes a number of structural and symbolic parallels between Ezek 40-48 and Rev 21-22. However, he significantly notes the divergence on the issue of the temple. "Ezek. 41 describes the measurements of the new Temple, and the parallel vision, Apoc. 21.22-22.5, opens, 'And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb': the glory of God which replaces the Temple is the theme of the vision." Ibid., 352.

<sup>3</sup>"The New Testament conception of believers as Israel (Mt. 19:28 [*sic*]; Lk. 22:30; Jn. 1:47; Rom. 9:6; 1 Cor 10:18; Gal. 6:16; Phil. 3:3; Rev. 7:1-8; 21:12), and the New Testament notion of Abraham's seed as those who, irrespective of descent, share his character (Jn. 8:33, 37-44; Rom. 4:11f., 16; Gal. 3:7; cf. Mt. 3:8f.; 1 Pet. 3:6) and his privileges (Gal. 3:29; Heb. 2:16), are therefore not spiritualizations of literal Old testament ideas, but direct inferences from the spiritual teaching of the Old Testament. If the promise that they should possess the gate of their enemies (Gn. 22:17) is also spiritualized by the New Testament (Lk. 1:72-5), this is only because the

In conclusion, four prophetic passages predict a prominent place for one or more of the Pentateuchal sacred times in a coming age of glory: Isa 56:3-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19. It is obvious that these passages have never been literally fulfilled in the past, and accordingly such passages have sometimes been seen as direct indicators of the continued applicability of these sacred times now and/or in the future. In other words, these passages have been cited as evidence of the permanence of one or more of the sacred times in terms of the first criterion used in this dissertation to establish

---

Old Testament itself demands a spiritual interpretation for the other promises. If Abraham is said by the New Testament, without explicit Old Testament authority, to be heir of the world (Rom. 4:13), this is not without Jewish precedent (Ecclus. 44:21 . . . ), and is in the New Testament simply a way of expressing the world-wide conquests of the gospel which the promises to Abraham do teach." Beckwith, 111. However, even if there were no Old Testament precedents for the broadening of the promise that Beckwith sees in the New Testament, it would still be consistent with the thrust of Old Testament prophecy and promise. As Waltke asks in the context of Heb 11:39, 40, "If God promised the fathers \$5 and he rewards them with \$5,000, is he unfaithful?" Bruce K. Waltke, "A Response," in Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for a Definition, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Pubs., 1992), 359.

From a New Testament perspective, according to Rev 21:1-8, the New Jerusalem descends directly from heaven (see vs. 2). However, according to the parallel passage of Isa 65:17-25, it is the earthly Jerusalem that is renewed as Yahweh's "joy" (גִּילָה; see vs. 18).

On the concept of ritual boundary, see above, p.

82.

whether a sacred time is permanent or temporary: that which concerns the canonical picture of its terminus ad quem.

A major problem with this approach is that it neglects the focus of such predictions on the postexilic period. Interpreting them as figurative predictions of the church and the eternal state also ignores the original context and makes a priori presuppositions about the role of the church and the nature of the eternal state more decisive for interpreting the text than the evidence of the text itself. The approach proposed here is to begin with a literal exegesis of the Old Testament predictions, but also to attempt to distinguish between conditional and unconditional elements of the prophecies.

It is the covenantal context of classical prophecy that provides the ultimate clue as to how any particular element should be classified. A survey of the Noachic, Abrahamic, Davidic, Sinaitic, and New covenants reveals a number of unconditional elements in all of them, such as the final inheritance of the land by a faithful remnant and the final coming of a righteous Davidic priest-king. However, conditional elements are also evident in all of them, such as the identity of those who will share in the covenant blessings and the time of their realization. The fact that the timing of the fulfillment of some Old Testament predictions may be conditional is of particular interest, for in a delayed fulfillment, it cannot be

assumed that details specific to the original setting will be completely or literally realized. For example, a literal realization of the prophetic descriptions of the sacrificial cultus or of nationalism cannot be automatically expected, nor can the literal application of ethnic and geographic designations and their associated ritual boundaries. Accordingly, Isa 56:3-8; 66:22, 23; Ezek 45:17-46:15; and Zech 14:16-19 are not subject to the first criterion concerning the canonical picture of the sacred times and their terminus ad quem.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Israel. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. First Series, Library of Biblical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917; reprint, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967.
- Adelman, Penina V. "The Golden Calf Jumps over the New Moon: Mythmaking among Jewish Women." Anima 16 (1989): 31-39.
- Adeney, Walter F. Ezra and Nehemiah. Limited Classical Reprint Library. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, 1980.
- Agus, Arlene. "This Month Is for You: Observing Rosh Hodesh as a Women's Holiday." In The Jewish Woman: New Perspectives, ed. Elizabeth Koltun, 31-39. New York: Schocken Books, 1976.
- Alexander, J. A. Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Rev. and ed. John Eadie. 2 vols. complete and unabridged in 1. Zondervan Classic Commentaries. N.p., 1865; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953.
- Alexander, Ralph H. "Ezekiel." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebeline. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986. 6:737-996.
- Allen, Leslie C. Ezekiel 20-48. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 29. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Structure and Meaning in Psalm 50." Vox Evangelica 14 (1984): 17-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. God Spake by Moses. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1951.

- Allis, O. T. Prophecy and the Church: An Examination of the Claim of Dispensationalists that the Christian Church Is a Mystery Parenthesis Which Interrupts the Fulfilment to Israel of the Kingdom Prophecies of the Old Testament. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1945.
- Ambrosius Commentaries in epistolam ad Romanos. Migne's Patrologia. 17:47-192.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Vol. 24A. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Vol. 24. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1980.
- Anderson, A. A. The Book of Psalms. Vol. 2, Psalms (73-150). Softback ed. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Publishing, 1981; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- Andreasen, Niels-Erik. "Festival and Freedom: A Study of an Old Testament Theme." Interpretation 28 (1974): 281-297.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 7. Missoula, MT: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Studies of the Old Testament Sabbath: Some Observations." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 86 (1974): 453-469.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Rest and Redemption: A Study of the Biblical Sabbath. Andrews University Monographs. Studies in Religion. Vol. 11. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978.
- The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Ed. R. H. Charles. Vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae. Vol. 29, The Old Law (1a2ae. 98-105). Trans. David Bourke and Arthur Littledale. Westminster: Blackfriars, 1969.

- Arichea, Daniel C., Jr. "Translating Biblical Festivals." The Bible Translator 32 (1981): 413-423.
- Ashley, Timothy R. The Book of Numbers. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Athanasius Letter 19: Easter, 347. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 2d series. 4:544-548.
- Auerbach, Elias. "Die Feste im alten Israel." Vetus Testamentum 8 (1958): 1-18.
- Augsburger, Daniel. "Calvin and the Mosaic Law." 2 vols. DSR thesis, Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg: Faculté de théologie protestante, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sabbath and Lord's Day during the Middle Ages." In The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand, 190-214. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- Augustine Against Two Letters of the Pelagians. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st series. 5:374-434.
- Augustine On the Spirit and the Letter. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st series. 5:80-114.
- Augustine Sermon 33. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st series. 6:362-365.
- The Babylonian Talmud. Ed. I. Epstein. 34 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1930-52.
- Bacchiocchi, Samuele. Divine Rest for Human Restlessness: A Theological Study of the Good News of the Sabbath for Today. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. God's Festivals in Scripture and History. Part 1, The Spring Festivals. Biblical Perspectives, no. 11. Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Sabbath in the New Testament: Answers to Questions. Biblical Perspectives, no. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1985.

- \_\_\_\_\_. From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977.
- Baeck, Leo. "Mystery and Commandment." In Contemporary Jewish Thought, ed. Simon Noveck, 195-203. New York: B'nai B'rith, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. This People Israel: The Meaning of Jewish Existence. Trans. Albert H. Friedlander. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1964.
- Bahnsen, Greg L. By This Standard: The Authority of God's Law Today. Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theonomy in Christian Ethics. 2d ed. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1984.
- Bakon, Shimon. "Sign—~~ת~~ן." Dor ledor 18 (1990): 241-250.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. "Short Notes: SEMAH as a Technical Term in the Prophets." Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964): 93-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972.
- Ball, Bryan W. The Seventh-day Men: Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales, 1600-1800. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Barthélemy, D., and J. T. Milik. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Vol. 1, Qumran Cave I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Barth, Markus. Israel and the Church: Contribution to a Dialogue Vital for Peace. Research in Theology. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1969.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. Studies in Qumran Law. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Beauchamp, Paul. Création et séparation: Étude exégétique du chapitre premier de la Genèse. Bibliothèque de sciences religieuses. Aubier Montaigne: Éditions du Cerf, 1969; Delachaux and Niestlé: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969.

- Beckwith, Roger T. "The Unity and Diversity of God's Covenants." Tyndale Bulletin 38 (1987): 93-118.
- Bergen, Robert D. "Preaching Old Testament Law." In Reclaiming the Prophetic Mantle: Preaching the Old Testament Faithfully, ed. by George L. Klein, 51-69. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992.
- Berger, Klaus. Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Part 1, Markus und Parallelen. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Vol. 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.
- The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. 4A, The Hagiographa: Transition from Translation to Midrash. Ed. Alexander Sperber. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- Blaikie, W. G. The Book of Joshua. The Expositor's Bible. Vol. 6. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Blenkinsopp, J. Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Second Isaiah--Prophet of Universalism." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 41 (June 1988): 83-103.
- Bloch, Abraham P. The Biblical and Historical Background of the Jewish Holy Days. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1978.
- Blomberg, Craig. "The Sabbath as Fulfilled in Christ: A Response to S. Bacchiocchi and J. Primus." In The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Traditions, ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi, Daniel J. Harrington, and William H. Shea, 122-128. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1991.
- Boecker, H. J. Klagelieder. Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament, no. 21. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1985.
- Bonar, Andrew A. A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus. Evansville, IN: Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959.

- The Book of Jubilees. Trans. James C. Vanderkam. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Vol. 511. Scriptores Aethiopici, no. 88. Louvain: Aedibus E. Peeters, 1989.
- Botterweck, G. J., D. N. Freedman, and J. Lundbom. "דָּוָר דֹּר." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Trans. John T. Willis and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978. 3:169-181.
- Bowman, John, and Shmarjahu Talmon. "Samaritan Decalogue Inscriptions." The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library Manchester 33 (1951):211-236.
- Bownd, Nicholas. The Doctrine of the Sabbath, Plainly Layed Forth, and Soundly Proved by Testimonies Both of Holy Scripture, and Also of Olde and New Ecclesiastical Writers. London: N.p., 1595.
- Braithwaite, Gilbert George. "The Doctrine of the Central Sanctuary in Deuteronomy." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978.
- Branson, Roy. "Sabbath--Heart of Jewish Unity." Journal of Ecumenical Studies 15 (1978): 716-737.
- Braulik, Georg. "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium." Biblica 51 (1970): 39-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die deuteronomischen Gesetze und der Dekalog Studien zum Aufbau von Deuteronomium 12-26. Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien, no. 145. Stuttgart; Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1991.
- Bright, John. Jeremiah. Anchor Bible. Vol. 21. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1965.
- Brooks, Roger. The Spirit of the Ten Commandments: Shattering the Myth of Rabbinic Legalism. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1990.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Ed. Jay P. Green. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979.

- Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistle to the Hebrews: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Buber, Martin. Moses. The East and West Library. Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1946.
- Butler, Trent C. Joshua. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 7. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Caird, George B. "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Canadian Journal of Theology 5 (1959): 44-51.
- Calvin, John. Commentary on the Book of Psalms. Vol. 2. Trans. James Anderson. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing company, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the form of a Harmony. Vol. 2. Trans. Charles William Bingham. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Corpus Reformatorum. Vol. 28, Sermons sur le Deuterome. Part four (sur les chapitres xxii.-xxxii., 19). Brunsvigae: Apud C. A. Schwetschke et Filium: 1885; first reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1964, and Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, G.m.b.H., 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Corpus Reformatorum. Vol. 56, Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia. Brunsvigae: Apud C. A. Schwetschke et Filium: 1885; first reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1964, and Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, G.m.b.H., 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. Trans. Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Campbell, Roderick. Israel and the New Covenant. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1954.

- Cardellini, Innocenzo. Die biblischen „Sklaven“-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts: Ein Beitrag zur Tradition, Überlieferung und Redaktion der alttestamentlichen Rechtstexte. Bonner biblische Beiträge. Vol. 55. Königstein: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1981.
- Carmichael, C. M. The Laws of Deuteronomy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Ten Commandments. The Ninth Sacks Lecture delivered on 25th May 1982. Oxford: The Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1983.
- Cassuto, Umberto. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. 2 vols. Trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961-64; reprint, 1989-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Commentary on the Book of Exodus. Trans. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967.
- Chadwick, G. A. "The Book of Exodus." In Genesis-Exodus, The Expositor's Bible, vol. 1, part 2. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Grace. Chicago, IL: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1939.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "The Greatest or the Least in the Kingdom? The Disciple's Relationship to the Law (Matt 5:17-20)." Trinity Journal 13 (1992): 139-162.
- Chary, Théphane, O.F.M. Aggée-Zacharie-Malachie. Sources bibliques. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1969.
- Childs, Brevard S. Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Christensen, Duane L. In Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi, 251-259. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums. Vol. 27. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.



- Chrysostom Homilies on 2 Corinthians: Homily 7, 2 Cor 3:7, 8. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st series. 9:390-395.
- Chrysostom Concerning the Statutes: Homily 12. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st series. 9:418-425.
- Claassen, W. T. "On a Recent Proposal as to a Distinction between P<sup>i</sup>el and Hiph<sup>c</sup>il." Journal of North-Western Semitic Languages 1 (1971): 3-10.
- Clement of Alexandria. The Stromata, or Miscellanies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 2:299-568.
- Clements, Roland E. "זָכַר zākhār." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Trans. David E. Green. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980. 4:82-87.
- Clines, David J. A. The Theme of the Pentateuch. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 10. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.
- Cohen, Hermann. Reason and Hope: Selections from the Jewish Writings of Hermann Cohen. Trans. Eva Jospe. New York: Norton, 1971; reprint, Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Cole, R. Alan. Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973.
- Collins, Kenneth J. "John Wesley's Platonic Conception of the Moral Law." Wesleyan Theological Journal 21 (1986): 116-128.
- Congdon, Roger Douglass. "Sabbatic Theology." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1949.
- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 7:385-508.
- Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum. Vol. 4, Letters and Treatises of Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig. December 1530-1533. Ed. C. D. Hartranft and E. E. Johnson. Norristown, PA: The Schwenckfelder Church and the Hartford Theological Seminary, 1914.

- Craigie, Peter C. The Book of Deuteronomy. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Psalms 1-50. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 19. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "St. Paul and the Law." Scottish Journal of Theology 17 (1964): 43-68.
- Culver, Robert D. "דָּוַר (dûr) heap up, pile, dwell." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Ed. R. Laird Harris et al. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980. 1:186, 187.
- Curtis, Edward Lewis, and Albert Alonzo Madsen. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910.
- Dahood, Mitchell. Review of The Torah [תורה]: The Five Books of Moses, a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic text. In Biblica 45 (1964): 281-283.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Vocative Lamedh in Exodus 2, 14 and Merismus in 34, 21." Biblica 62 (1981): 413-15.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Trans. Paul P. Levertoff. New York: Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Davidson, Richard M. "The Garden of Eden a Sanctuary?" Unpublished paper, 1996, Andrews University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." Journal of the Adventist Theological Society 5/1 (Summer 1994): 14-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sanctuary Typology." In Symposium on Revelation, Book 1, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 6, 99-130. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Structures. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.

- Davidson, Robert. Genesis 1-11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Davies, W. D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Brown Judaic Studies, no. 186. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series. Vol. 7. Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- Dekar, Paul R. "Does the State of Israel Have Theological Significance?" Theodolite: A Journal of Christian Thought and Practice 7/1 (1983); reprinted in The Conrad Grebel Review 2 (1984): 45, 46.
- Delitzsch, F. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Vol. 2. Trans. James Martin. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- de Vaux, R., and J. T. Milik. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Vol. 6, Qumrân Grotte 4, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Dillard, Raymond B. 2 Chronicles. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 15. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Douglas, Walter B. "The Sabbath in Puritanism." In The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand, 229-243. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Genesis Creation Story: Its Literary Structure. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 5. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978.
- Doukhan, Jacques. Drinking at the Sources: An Appeal to the Jew and the Christian to Note Their Common Beginnings. Trans. Walter R. Beach and Robert M. Johnston. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hebrew for Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993.
- Dressler, Harold H. P. "The Sabbath in the Old Testament." In From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation, ed. D. A. Carson, 21-41. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.

- Driver, G. R. "Ugaritic and Hebrew Words." Ugaritica 6 (1969): 181-186.
- Duhm, Bernhard. Das Buch Jesaia. 5th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Psalmen. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Vol. 14. Freiburg I. B.: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- Dumbrell, William J. "The Covenant with Abraham." Reformed Theological Review 41 (1982): 42-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The End of the Beginning. Homebush, New South Wales: Lancer Books, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prospect of Unconditionality in the Sinaitic Covenant." In Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi, 141-155. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Durham, John I. Exodus. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 3. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Easton, B. S., and Ralph W. Vunderink. "Gate." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Rev. ed., 1982. 2:408.
- Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 vols. New York: Longman, Green, and Company, 1899.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Ezekiel: A Commentary. Trans. Cosslett Quinn. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Ezra, Abraham Ibn. The Commentary of Abraham Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch. Vol. 3, Leviticus. Trans. Jay F. Shachter. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1986.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. An Exposition of Ezekiel. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960.
- Feinberg, Charles Lee. "Jeremiah." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986. 6:357-691.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Prophecy of Ezekiel: The Glory of the Lord. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1969.

- Felder, Cain H. "Partiality and God's Law: An Exegesis of James 2:1-13." The Journal of Religious Thought 39/2 (Fall-Winter 1982-83): 51-69.
- Fishbane, M. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts. New York: Schocken Books, 1979.
- Ford, Desmond. The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Forgotten Day. Newcastle, CA: Desmond Ford Publications, 1981.
- Freedman, David Noel. "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation." Interpretation 18 (1964): 419-431.
- Fuller, D. P. Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?—The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and the Works of the Law." Westminster Theological Journal 38 (1975): 28-42.
- Gage, W. A. The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology. Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter books, 1984.
- Gane, Roy. "'Bread of the Presence' and Creator-in-Residence." Vetus Testamentum 42 (1992): 179-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Laws of the Seventh and Fiftieth Years." The Journal of the Association of Graduate Near Eastern Students 1 (1990): 2-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Macrostructural Comparisons between Israelite, Babylonian, and Hittite Ritual Days of Sancta Purification." Prepared for the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meetings, Chicago, IL, November, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ritual Dynamic Structure: Systems Theory and Ritual Syntax Applied to Selected Ancient Israelite, Babylonian and Hittite Festival Days." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1992.

- Gdanz, Solomon. "The Calendar of Ancient Israel." In Homenaje a Millás-Vallicrosa, 1:625-646. Barcelona: Consejo Superiore de Investigaciones Científicas, 1954.
- Gerstner, J. H. "Law in the NT." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Rev. ed., 1986. 3:85-91.
- Gesenius, W. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Ed. E. Kautsch. Trans. A. E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910; reprint New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Gibert, Pierre. "Vers une intelligence nouvelle du Pentateuque?" Revue des sciences religieuses 80 (1992): 55-80.
- Giem, Paul. "Sabbatōn in Col 2:16." Andrews University Seminary Studies 19 (1981): 195-210.
- Gileadi, Avraham. "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection." In Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, 157-163. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Ginsberg, H. L. The Israelean Heritage of Judaism. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Vol. 24. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1982.
- God's Festivals and Holy Days. N.p.: Worldwide Church of God, 1992.
- Goldstein, Bernard R., and Alan Cooper. "The Festivals of Israel and Judah and the Literary History of the Pentateuch." Journal of the American Oriental Society 110 (1910): 19-31.
- Goulder, M. D. "The Apocalypse as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies." New Testament Studies 27 (1981): 342-367.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Decalogue in Early Christianity." Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947): 1-17.
- The Greek New Testament. 4th rev. ed. Ed. Barbara Aland et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

- Green, William Henry. The Hebrew Feasts in Their Relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses Concerning the Pentateuch. The Newton Lectures for 1885. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1885.
- Greenberg, Irving. The Jewish Way: Living the Holidays. New York: Summit Books, 1988.
- Greenberg, Moshe. Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Vol. 22. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1983.
- Greenstone, Julius H. Jewish Feasts and Fasts. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1946.
- Greidanus, Sidney. "The Universal Dimension of Law in the Hebrew Scriptures." Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses 14 (1985): 39-51.
- Griffith, Richard James. "The Eschatological Significance of the Sabbath." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1990.
- Grogan, Geoffrey W. "Isaiah." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986. 6:3-354.
- Gundry, R. H. "Grace, Works and Staying Saved in Paul." Biblica 66 (1985): 1-38.
- Haag, E. "שַׁבָּת šabbāt." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1993. 7:1047-1057.
- Halbe, Jörn. "Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Wesen des Massotfestes." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 87 (1975): 324-326.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Privilegrecht Jahwes: Ex 34, 10-26. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975.
- Hallo, William W. "New Moons and Sabbaths: A Case-Study in the Contrastive Approach." Hebrew Union College Annual 48 (1977): 1-18.
- Hamilton, Victor P. The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "שָׁבַת (*shābat*) cease, desist, rest." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Ed. R. Laird Harris et al. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980. 2:902, 903.
- Harris, Monford. Exodus and Exile: The Structure of the Jewish Holidays. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Harris, R. Laird. "Leviticus." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank A. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, 1990. 2:501-654.
- Harrison, R. K. Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Law in the OT." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Rev. ed., 1986. 3:81-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.
- Hart, Ian. "Genesis 1:1-2:3 as Prologue." Tyndale Bulletin 46 (1995): 315-336.
- Hartley, John E. Leviticus. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 4. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. Covenant in Blood. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks." In The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3, 3-63. Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Israel in Bible Prophecy." Journal of the Adventist Theological Society 3/1 (Spring 1992): 120-155.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate. 4th ed. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Polemical Nature of the Genesis Cosmology." Evangelical Quarterly 46 (1974): 81-102.



- \_\_\_\_\_. The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews University Monographs. Studies in Religion. Vol. 5. 3d ed. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century: Part I." Andrews University Seminary Studies 5 (1967): 101-121.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century: Part II." Andrews University Seminary Studies 6 (1968): 19-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sabbath in the Pentateuch." In The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand, 21-43. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis 1 in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels." Andrews University Seminary Studies 10 (1972): 1-20.
- Hasel, Gerhard F., and W. G. C. Murdoch. "The Sabbath in the Prophetic and Historical Literature of the Old Testament." In The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand, 44-56. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- Haufe, Christoph. "Die Stellung des Paulus zum Gesetz." Theologische Literaturzeitung 91 (1966): 171-178.
- Hawkins, Yisrayl. The Sabbath: Every Question Answered. Abilene, TX: House of Yahweh, 1992.
- Hayes, John H. Amos the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- Hayes, John H., and Stuart A. Irvine. Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1987.
- Haynes, Stephen R. Prospects for Post-Holocaust Theology. American Academy of Religion Academy Series, no. 77. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud. 7 vols. Ed. I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1960-84.

- Hein, Kenneth. "A Catholic Response to J. B. Doukhan." In The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Tradition, ed. by Tamara C. Eskenazi et al., 169-175. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1991.
- Heschel, Abraham J. The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1951.
- Hess, Richard S. "Genesis 1-2 in Its Literary Context." Tyndale Bulletin 41 (1990): 143-153.
- Holbrook, Frank B. "Should Christians Observe the Israelite Festivals? A Brief Statement of SDA Understanding." Prepared for the Biblical Research Institute, July, 1987.
- Holmgren, Frederick. "A New Covenant? For Whom?" Covenant Quarterly 43 (1985): 39-44.
- Hopkins, Joseph Martin. The Armstrong Empire: A Look at the Worldwide Church of God. N.p.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.
- Hubbard, David Allan. Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Joel and Amos: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989.
- Hummel, Horace D. "Law and Grace in Judaism and Lutheranism." The Lutheran Quarterly 21 (1969): 416-427.
- Hyatt, P. J. Exodus. Rev. softback ed. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980; London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Publishing, 1980.
- Irenaeus Against Heresies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1:309-567.
- Jackson, Bernard S. "The Ceremonial and the Judicial: Biblical Law as Sign and Symbol." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 30 (1984): 25-30.
- Jaki, Stanley L. "The Sabbath-Rest of the Maker of All." Asbury Theological Journal 50/1 (Spring 1995): 37-49.
- Jenni, Ernst. Das Hebräische Pi<sup>c</sup>el. Zürich: EVZ, 1968.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "עולם 'ōlām Ewigkeit." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 4th rev. ed. Ed. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1984; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984. 2:228-243.
- Johnsson, William G. "Conditionality in Biblical Prophecy with Particular Reference to Apocalyptic." In The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3, 259-287.
- Johnston, Robert M. "Jewish Roots of the Lord's Supper." Shabbat Shalom, December 1994, 15, 16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath." Andrews University Seminary Studies 12 (1974): 94-102.
- Jordan, James B. Christianity and the Calendar: A Syllabus. Niceville, FL: Biblical Horizons, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Covenant Sequence in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Reconsidering the Mosaic Law: Some Reflections--1988. Biblical Horizons Occasional Paper, no. 4. 2d ed. Tyler, TX: Biblical Horizons, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Tabernacle: A New Creation. Biblical Horizons Occasional Paper, no. 5. Tyler, TX: Biblical Horizons, 1988.
- Josephus Antiquities of the Jews. In The Works of Josephus, new updated ed., trans. William Whiston, 29-542. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987.
- Joüon, Paul, S.J. A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Trans. and rev. T. Muraoka. Reprint of 1st Edition, with Corrections. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica, no. 14. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
- Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. Back toward the Future: Hints for Interpreting Biblical Prophecy. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Davidic Promise and the Inclusion of the Gentiles (Amos 9:9-15 and Acts 15:13-18): A Test Passage for Theological Systems." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 21 (1978): 47-65.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Exodus." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1990. 2:287-497.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "God's Promise Plan and His Gracious Law." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 33 (1990): 289-302.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "How Can Christians Derive Principles from the Specific Commands of the Law?" In Theory and Method, Readings in Christian Ethics, vol. 1, ed. David K. Clark and Robert V. Rakestraw, 192-201. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Messiah in the Old Testament. Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Toward Old Testament Ethics. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books from Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Uses of the Old Testament in the New. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Weightier and Lighter Matters of the Law." In Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, 176-192. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- Kalland, Earl S. "Deuteronomy." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1992. 3:3-235.
- Kalluveettil, Paul. Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East. *Analecta biblica. Investigationes scientificae in res biblicas*, 88. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Kalusche, Martin. "'Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie'? Anmerkungen zu einem Entwurf Peter Stuhlmachers." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 77 (1986): 194-205.

- Käsemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans. Trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. History of the Religion of Israel. Vol. 4, From the Babylonian Captivity to the End of Prophecy. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1977; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1977; Dallas, TX; Institute for Jewish Studies, 1977.
- Kearney, Peter J. "Creation and Liturgy. The P Redaction of Ex 25-40." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 89 (1977): 375-387.
- Keil, C. F. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel. Vol. 2. Trans. James Martin. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. Vol. 1. Trans. David Patrick and James Kennedy. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Twelve Minor Prophets. Vol. 1. Trans. James Martin. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. Joshua, Judges, Ruth. Trans. James Martin. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pentateuch. Vol. 1. Trans. James Martin. Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pentateuch. Vol. 2. Trans. James Martin. Biblical Commentary. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Fourth Series. Vol. 3. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pentateuch. Vol. 3. Trans. James Martin. Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- Kidner, Derek. Ezra and Nehemiah: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Psalms 1-72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Tyndale Press, 1973; 2d American Printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.
- Kiker, C. W. "The Sabbath in the Old Testament Cult." Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1968.
- Kiuchi, N. The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 56. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1987.
- Koehler, Ludwig H., and Walter Baumgartner. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.
- Kraus, H.-J. Worship in Israel. Trans. Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Küng, Hans. Judaism: Between Yesterday and Today. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992.
- Kutsch, Ernst. "מקדש." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 65 (1953): 247-253.
- Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.
- Lang, G. H. "God's Covenants are Conditional." Evangelical Quarterly 30 (1958): 86-97.
- Larkin, W. J., Jr. Culture and Biblical Hermeneutics: Interpreting and Applying the Authoritative Word in a Relativistic Age. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- LaRondelle, Hans K. The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation. Andrews University Monographs. Studies in Religion. Vol. 13. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.
- The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts. Reprinted from the copy of the 1648 ed. in the Henry E. Huntington Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Zechariah. Wartburg Press, 1956; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1971.

- Levenson, Jon D. Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985.
- Levine, Baruch A. Leviticus מִדְבָּר. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Die *huqqim ūmišpātīm* im Buch Deuteronomium." Biblica 70 (1989): 22-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Covenant Never Revoked: Biblical Reflections on Christian-Jewish Dialogue. Trans. John J. Scullion. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Kennt das Alt Testament einen Unterschied von »Gebot« und »Gesetz«?: Zur bibeltheologischen Einstufung des Dekalogs." In »Gesetz« als Thema biblischer Theologie, Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, ed. Ingo Baldermann et al., vol. 4, 63-89. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.
- Longman, Tremper, III. "God's Law and Mosaic Punishments Today." In Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books, 41-54. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.
- Lowe, Harry W. Radio Church of God: How Its Teachings Differ from Those of Seventh-day Adventists. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1970.
- Luther, Martin. "The Large Catechism," 1529. In The Book of Concord, 357-461, trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Luther's Works. Vol. 1, Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1-5. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Luther's Works. American ed. Vol. 35, Word and Sacrament, I. Ed. E. Theodore Bachman. Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Luther's Works. American ed. Vol. 40, Church and Ministry, II. Ed. Conrad Bergendoff. Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.
- MacRae, Alan A. "עֲלָם (ʿlām)." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Ed. R. Laird Harris et al. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980. 2:672-673.

- Maertens, Thierry, O.S.B. A Feast in Honour of Yahweh: A Study in the Meaning of Worship. Trans. Mother Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J. With a foreword by Eugene H. Maly. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966.
- Maier, Gerhard. Der Prophet Haggai und der Prophet Maleachi. Wuppertaler Studienbibel, Altes Testament. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1985.
- The Manual of Discipline. Trans. P. Wernberg-Møller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judaea. Vol. 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.
- Marshall, Jay W. Israel and the Book of the Covenant: An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Law. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 140. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Martens, Elmer A. "Embracing the Law: A Biblical Theological Perspective." Bulletin for Biblical Research 2 (1992): 1-28.
- Martens, John W. "The Superfluity of the Law in Philo and Paul: A Study in the History of Religions." Ph.D. thesis, McMaster University, 1991.
- Marti, D. Karl. Das Buch Jesaja. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Vol. 10. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.
- Martin, John A. "Christ, the Fulfillment of the Law in the Sermon on the Mount." In Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, 248-263. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.
- Martyr, Justin. Dialogue with Trypho. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1:194-270.
- Mays, James Luther. Hosea: A Commentary. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1985.
- McConville, J. G. Law and Theology in Deuteronomy. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.



McCown, C. C. "City." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Ed. G. A. Buttrick et al. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1962. 1:632-638.

Mechilta: Ein Tannaitischer Midrasch zu Exodus.  
Trans. Jakob Winter and August Wünsche. Leipzig:  
J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909; reprint,  
Hildesheim: Georg Olms-Verlag, 1990.

Meier, Samuel A. "The Sabbath and Purification Cycles."  
In The Sabbath in Jewish and Christian Traditions, ed.  
Tamara C. Eskenazi, Daniel J. Harrington, and William  
H. Shea, 3-11. New York: Crossroad Publishing  
Company, 1991.

The Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael. Ed. and trans. J. Z.  
Lauterbach. 3 vols. The Schiff Library of Jewish  
Classics. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication  
Society of America, 1933-35.

Meyer, F. B. The Prophet of Hope: Studies in Zechariah.  
London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952.

Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. Zechariah 9-14.  
Anchor Bible. Vol. 25C. New York: Doubleday and  
Company, 1993.

Midrash al Torah Neviim uketuvim shelakat vehibar Shimon,  
rosh hadar shanim mekehila kedosha. 2 vols.  
Jerusalem: Lewin-Epstein, 1970.

The Midrash on Psalms. 2 vols. Trans. William G. Braude.  
Yale Judaica Series. Vol. 13. New Haven, CT: Yale  
University Press, 1959.

Midrash Rabbah. Trans. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. 10  
vols. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Atonement, Day of." Interpreter's  
Dictionary of the Bible Supplement. Ed. Keith Crim.  
Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976. 82-83.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Concerning Jeremiah's Repudiation of  
Sacrifice." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche  
Wissenschaft 89 (1977): 273-275.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Day of Atonement." Encyclopedia Judaica  
1970. 5:1384-1387.

\_\_\_\_\_. Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with  
Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible. Vol. 3.  
New York: Doubleday, 1991.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Numbers במדבר. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel." Journal of Biblical Literature 101 (1982): 169-176.
- The Mishna. Trans. Herbert Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Möller, W., and J. B. Payne. "Atonement, Day of." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Rev. ed., 1982. 1:360-362.
- Montefiore, C. G. Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings. London: McMillan and Company, 1930.
- Montgomery, J. A. A Commentary on Daniel. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927.
- Moo, Douglas J. "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 20 (1984): 3-49.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927; reprint, 1962.
- Morgan, Donn F. "The So-Called Cultic Calendars in the Pentateuch: A Morphological and Typological Study." Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974.
- Morley, R. W. L. At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 22. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Munilla, Luis. The Seven Feasts of the Lord and the Jubilee. Jemison, AL: By the author, 1990.
- Murray, John. Collected Writings of John Murray. Vol. 1, The Claims of Truth. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976.
- Myers, Jacob M. Ezra-Nehemiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Anchor Bible. Vol. 14. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965.

- Nash, Kathleen Sarah. "The Palestinian Agricultural Year and the Book of Joel." Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1989.
- Noth, Martin. Exodus: A Commentary. Trans. J. S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Leviticus: A Commentary. Trans. J. E. Anderson. The Old Testament Library. London: S.C.M. Press, 1965.
- Oswalt, John N. "Wesley's Use of the Old Testament in His Doctrinal Teachings." Wesleyan Theological Journal 12 (1977): 39-53.
- Owusu-Antwi, Brempong. The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27. Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series. Vol. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1995.
- Paley, William. The Works of William Paley. Complete in 1 vol. New ed. Philadelphia, PA: Crissy and Markley, n.d.
- Patrick, Dale. Old Testament Law. Atlanta. GA: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Paul, M. J. "The Order of Melchizedek (Ps 110:4 and Heb 7:3)." Westminster Theological Journal 49 (1987): 195-211.
- Paul, Shalom M. Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Vol. 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Paulien, Jon. Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 11. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988.
- Pedersen, J. Israel: Its Life and Culture. Vols. 3-4. Trans. Annie I. Fausbøll. Rev. ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1940; Copenhagen: Povl Branner, 1940.

- Pesikta de Rav Kahana. Trans. Bernard Mandelbaum. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.
- Pesikta Rabbati. 2 vols. Trans. William G. Braude. Yale Judaica Series. Vol. 18. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Philo. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1929-62; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929-62.
- Philo "On the Account of the World's Creation Given by Moses." Trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library. Philo. 1:6-137.
- Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer. Trans. Gerald Friedlander. London: n.p., 1916; reprint New York: B. Blom, 1971.
- Porter, James L. The Sabbaths of God: The Meaning of God's Holy Days to Christians. New York: Exposition Press, 1966.
- Poythress, Vern S. "Effects of Interpretive Frameworks on the Application of Old Testament Law." In Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books, 103-123. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.
- Preuß, H. "עֲלָם 'ôlām." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:1144-1159.
- Provan, Iain W. "Feasts, Booths and Gardens (Thr 2, 6a)." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 102 (1990): 254, 255.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lamentations. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Harper Collins Religious, Marshall Pickering, 1991; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Pseudo-Clement Recognitions of Clement. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 8:75-211.
- Pseudo-Jonathan. Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Uziel zum Pentateuch): Nach der Londoner Handschrift. Ed. Moses Ginsburger. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971.

- Pseudo-Philo. The Biblical Antiquities of Philo.  
Trans. M. R. James. Translations of Early Documents.  
Series 1, Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic).  
Vol. 12. London: Society for Promoting Christian  
Knowledge, 1917; New York: Macmillan Press, 1917.
- Ptolemy. Lettre à Flora. Trans. and ed. Gilles Quispel.  
2d ed. Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Les Éditions du  
Cerf, 1966.
- Ramban (Nachmanides). Ramban (Nachmanides): Commentary on  
the Torah, ~~פרש' רמב"ם~~ Exodus. Trans. and ann. Charles B.  
Chavel. New York: Shilo Publishing House, 1973.
- Random House Webster's College Dictionary. New York:  
Random House, 1992. S.v. "to indicate."
- Reventlow, H. G. Das Heiligtumsgesetz. Wissenschaftliche  
Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Vol. 6.  
Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag der  
Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth  
Century. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia, PA:  
Fortress Press, 1986.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "The Prophetic Literality of Tribal  
Reconstruction." In Israel's Apostasy and  
Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison,  
ed. Avraham Gileadi, 273-281. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker  
Book House, 1988.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "Hosea and the Sacrificial Cultus."  
Restoration Quarterly 15 (1972): 15-26.
- Robertson, O. Palmer. The Christ of the Covenants.  
Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing  
Company, 1980.
- Robinson, Gnana. "The Idea of Rest in the Old Testament  
and the Search for the Basic Character of Sabbath."  
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 92  
(1980): 2-42.
- "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy." Seventh-  
day Adventist Bible Commentary. Ed. F. D. Nichol.  
Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing  
Association, 1955; rev. ed., 1977, 4:25-38.

- Rose, Martin. 5. Mose. Vol. 1, 5. Mose 12-25: Einführung und Gesetze. Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament, no. 5.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 5. Mose. Vol. 2, 5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34: Rahmenstücke zum Gesetzeskorpus. Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament, no. 5.2. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994.
- Rushdoony, Rousas J. Institutes of Biblical Law. Phillipsburg, NJ: Craig Press, 1973.
- Ryrie, Charles C. "The End of the Law." Bibliotheca Sacra 124 (1967): 239-247.
- Sacks, Robert D. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies. Vol. 6. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon Press, 1990.
- Sailhamer, John H. "Genesis." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1990. 2:1-284.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, Academic and Professional Books, 1992.
- Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sarna, Nahum M. Understanding Genesis. The Melton Research Center Series, the Heritage of Biblical Israel. Vol. 1. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Exodus ~~1992~~. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- Schneider, Dieter. Das fünfte Buch Moses. Wuppertaler Studienbibel, Altes Testament. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1982.
- Schramm, Brooks. The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 193. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "The Abolition and Fulfillment of the Law in Paul." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 35 (1989): 47-74.

Scott, W. R. "The Booths of Ancient Israel's Autumn Festival." Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1993.

Segal, J. B. The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A. D. 70. London Oriental Series. Vol. 12. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Segal, M. H. The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship and Other Biblical Studies. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967.

Sehmsdorf, Eberhard. "Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jesaja 56-66 (II): (Jes 66 17-24)." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 84 (1972): 562-576.

Septuaginta. 2 vols. in 1. Ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: 1935, 1979.

Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. 7 vols. Ed. Francis D. Nichol. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953-1957; rev. ed., 1976-1980.

Shea, William H. "The Investigative Judgment of Judah, Ezekiel 1-10." In The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, 283-291. Washington, DC: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Literary Form and Theological Function in Leviticus." In The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3, 134-151. Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27." In The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3, 75-118. Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.

Sifre to Deuteronomy. Trans. Jacob Neusner. Brown Judaic Studies. Vols. 98 and 101. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.

- Siker-Gieseler, Jeffrey. "The Theology of the Sabbath in the Old Testament: A Canonical Approach." Studia biblica et theologica 11 (1981): 5-20.
- Simon, Maurice. Berakoth: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices. London: Soncino Press, 1948.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. "Faith and Law: An Essay toward Jewish-Christian Dialogue." Journal of Ecumenical Studies 18 (1981): 93-103.
- Smith, Ralph L. Micah-Malachi. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 32. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984.
- Speiser, E. A. Genesis. The Anchor Bible. Vol. 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1969.
- Stein, Robert H. The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Stemberger, Günter. "Der Dekalog im frühen Judentum." In »Gesetz« als Thema biblischer Theologie, Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, ed. Ingo Baldermann et al., vol. 4, 91-103. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.
- Strand, Kenneth A. "Sabbath and Sunday in the Reformation Era." In The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand, 215-228. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982.
- Stob, Henry. "Natural Law Ethics: An Appraisal." Calvin Theological Journal 20 (1985): 58-68.
- Stuart, Douglas. Hosea-Jonah. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 31. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie." In Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie, 136-165. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1981.
- Sun, Henry T. C. "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-26)." Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1990.
- The Targum of Isaiah. Trans. and ed. J. F. Stenning. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.



- Taylor, John B. Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary. London: Tyndale Press, 1969; 2d American Printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.
- The Temple Scroll. Ed. Yigael Yadin. Vol. 2, Text and Commentary. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Tertullian An Answer to the Jews. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 3:151-173.
- Tertullian On Idolatry. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 3:61-71.
- Tertullian On Modesty. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 4:74-101.
- Theophilus Theophilus to Autolyctus. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 2:94-121.
- Thielman, Frank. "The Coherence of Paul's View of the Law: The Evidence of First Corinthians." New Testament Studies 38 (1992): 235-253.
- Thompson, J. A. The Book of Jeremiah. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester, 1974; 3d American Printing, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.
- Tiessen, Terrance. "Toward a Hermeneutic for Discerning Universal Moral Absolutes." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 36 (1993): 189-207.
- Tomson, Peter J. Paul and the Jewish Law. Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 3. Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature. Vol. 1. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum and Company, 1990; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah." In Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, no. 54, 145-167. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters Leuven and Leuven University Press, 1981.

- Tsevat, Matitiah. "The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 84 (1972): 447-459.
- Tuell, Steven Shawn. "The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48." Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1989.
- Turner, Laurence A. Announcements of Plot in Genesis. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 96. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, JSOT Press, 1990.
- Unger, Merrill F. Zechariah: Prophet of Messiah's Glory. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of the Sabbath." Bibliotheca Sacra 123 (1966): 53-59.
- van Buren, Paul M. A Theology of the Jewish-Christian Reality. Part 2, A Christian Theology of the People Israel. Paperback ed. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1987.
- van Goudoever, J. Biblical Calendars. 2d rev. ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Van Groningen, Gerard. Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990.
- van Houten, Christiana. The Alien in Israelite Law. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 107. Sheffield: JSOT Press, Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- VanGemeren, Willem A. "Psalms." The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1991. 5:1-880.
- Verdam, P. J. "Mosaic Law in Practice and Study throughout the Ages." Free University Quarterly 9 (1959): 31-81.
- Verhoef, Pieter A. The Books of Haggai and Malachi. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- Vogels, Walter W. F. God's Universal Covenant: A Biblical Study. Ottawa: Saint Paul University and University of Ottawa Press, 1979.

- Vokes, F. E. "The Ten Commandments in the New Testament and in First Century Judaism." In Studia Evangelica, vol. 5: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965, Part 2: The New Testament Message, ed. F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Deuteronomy: A Commentary. Trans. Dorothea Barton. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1966.
- Wagner, Walter H. "Luther and the Positive Use of the Law." Journal of Religious History 11 (1980): 45-63.
- Wallace, Howard N. "Genesis 2:1-3--Creation and Sabbath." Pacifica 1 (1988): 235-250.
- Wallis, Wilber B. "Irony in Jeremiah's Prophecy of a New Covenant." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 12 (1969): 107-110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? by D. P. Fuller. In Covenant Seminary Review 8 (1982): 72-82.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "The Phenomenon of Conditionality within Unconditional Covenants." In Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison, ed. Avraham Gileadi, 123-139. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Response." In Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition, ed. Craig A. Blaising and Darrell L. Bock, 347-359. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House Academic and Professional Books, Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theonomy in Relation to Dispensational and Covenant Theologies." In Theonomy: A Reformed Critique, ed. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, Academie Books, 59-86. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Walton, John H. Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989.
- Wambacq, B. N. "Les Massot." Biblica 61 (1980): 31-54.
- Watts, John D. W. "Infinitive Absolute as Imperative." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 74 (1962): 141-145.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Isaiah 1-33. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 24. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Isaiah 34-66. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 25. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament." Journal of the American Oriental Society 90 (1970): 184-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the LORD--The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3." In Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles, ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor, 501-512. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 212. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon und Bercker, 1981.
- Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Scholars Press Reprints and Translations Series. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1885; reprinted with new prefatory matter, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Wenham, David. "Jesus and the Law: An Exegesis on Matthew 5:17-20." Themelios 4 (1979): 92-96.
- Wenham, G. J. The Book of Leviticus. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Genesis 1-15. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 1. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Pentateuchal Source Criticism." Vetus Testamentum 41 (1991): 84-109.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Perplexing Pentateuch." Vox Evangelica 17 (1987): 7-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story." Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies 9 (1986): 19-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Were David's Sons Priests?" Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 87 (1975): 79-82.
- Wesley, John. Wesley's Standard Sermons. 2 vols. Ed. Edmund H. Sugden. London: Epworth Press, 1951.
- Westerholm, Stephen. Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- Westermann, Claus. Elements of Old Testament Theology. Trans. Douglas W. Scott. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Genesis 12-36. Trans. John J. Scullion, Jr. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985.
- Whitcomb, John C. "Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel." Grace Theological Journal 6 (1985): 201-217.
- Whitney, G. E. "Alternative Interpretations of לֹא in Exodus 6:3 and Jeremiah 7:22." Westminster Theological Journal 48 (1986): 151-159.
- Wigram, George V. The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance: Coded to Strong's Concordance Numbering System. Rev. Jay P. Green. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984.
- Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Syntax: An Outline. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- Wright, Christopher J. "The Ethical Authority of the Old Testament: A Survey of Approaches--Part II." Tyndale Bulletin 43 (1992): 203-231.
- Wold, D. J. "The Meaning of the Biblical Penalty Kareth." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1978.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea. Trans. Gary Stansell. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1965.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos. Trans. Waldemar Janzen et al. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Wyschogrod, Michael. "A Jewish View of Christianity." In Toward a Theological Encounter: Jewish Understandings of Christianity, ed. Rabbi Leon Klenicki, Studies in Judaism and Christianity, Exploration of Issues in the Contemporary Dialogue between Christians and Jews, A Stimulus Book, 104-119. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Law, Jews and Gentiles--A Jewish Perspective." The Lutheran Quarterly 21 (1969): 405-415.
- Yadin, Yigael. Tefillin from Qumran (X Q Phyl 1-4). Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969.
- Yamashiro, George. "A Study of the Hebrew Word Sabbath in Biblical and Talmudic Literatures." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1955.
- Young, E. J. The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes. Vol. 3, Chapters 40 through 66. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Youngblood, Ronald. "The Abrahamic Covenant. Conditional or Unconditional?" In The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honor of Samuel J. Schultz, ed. Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood, 31-46. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Zens, Jon. "'This Is My Beloved Son . . . Hear Him': A Study of the Development of Law in the History of Redemption." Baptist Theological Review 7/4 (1978): 15-52.